MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1961

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
CHARLES RAPER JONAS, North Carolina
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin

FRANK SANDERS, *Staff Assistant to the Subcommittee*

PART 2

Overall Statements
Department of the Air Force
Reserve Components
Loran Stations
Testimony of Members of Congress, Interested Organizations and Individuals

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
54569 WASHINGTON : 1960

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas
HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California
ALBERT THOMAS, Texas
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia
OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
JOHN F. SHELLEY, California
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
DON MAGNUSON, Washington
WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana
TOM STEED, Oklahoma
HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, North Carolina
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New York
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, Illinois

JOHN TABER, New York
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
WALT HORAN, Washington
GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey
IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania
GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio
CHARLES RAPER JONAS, North Carolina
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Michigan
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, California
JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona
JOHN R. PILLION, New York
PHIL WEAVER, Nebraska
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Ohio
KEITH THOMSON, Wyoming
ROBERT H. MICHEL, Illinois
SILVIO O. CONTE, Massachusetts

KENNETH SPRANKLE, *Clerk and Staff Director*

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1961

MARCH 21, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WITNESSES

FRANKLIN B. LINCOLN, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, COMPTROLLER
HAROLD R. LOGAN, DEPUTY COMPTROLLER, BUDGET OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)
MAURICE H. LANMAN, JR., ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL (FISCAL MATTERS), OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
HARRY W. POOLE, CHIEF, CONSTRUCTION BRANCH, BUDGET DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will please come to order. We are starting our hearings this morning on the Department of Defense construction bill, and we have before us the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Franklin Lincoln, and his associates.

Do you have a statement you would like to make to the committee?

Mr. LINCOLN. I do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed and we shall not interrupt you.

STATEMENT OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, COMPTROLLER

Mr. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to present and discuss the financial aspects of the military construction programs for fiscal year 1961. It is my understanding that, following my appearance here today, the committee will hear statements by the military departments as to the cost and validity of the detailed "line item" and then a summary statement by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations). Accordingly, I will limit my remarks to the overall budgetary and fiscal aspects of the construction program.

As the committee has no doubt noted, the regular fiscal year 1961 budget request, transmitted to the Congress in January, for the first time in recent years includes funds for the military construction programs. Although these programs have always been formulated in context with all the other programs of the Department of Defense, during fiscal years 1952 through 1960 the budget request for military construction was transmitted separately to the Congress at a later date.

The fiscal year 1961 budget includes 12 separate military construction appropriations. The first three are for the active Army, Navy, and Air Force. The next five are for the reserve components—

Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserves, and the Army and Air National Guards. The requirements of the Marine Corps Reserve are included in the Navy Reserve appropriation. Three new appropriations, one each for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, are proposed for the construction and acquisition of military family housing and community facilities in foreign countries through the use of foreign currency.

Heretofore, foreign currency requirements for this purpose were not included in the Department of Defense budget or specifically appropriated by the Congress. However, it is now deemed desirable to bring the control of these foreign currencies under a more formal system, in order to establish uniformity throughout the Government and to bring their utilization into the normal budgetary and appropriation channels. Accordingly, we are requesting the appropriation of the dollars needed to purchase the foreign currencies required in the coming fiscal year for the construction and acquisition of military family housing and community facilities in foreign countries.

A separate appropriation is again included for the construction of loran station, worldwide. The funds in this appropriation are transferred in one lump sum to the Coast Guard each fiscal year.

The President's budget does not include any new obligational authority for construction to meet the requirements for the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA). It appears, however, that some additional authority to transfer funds from "Salaries and expenses, ARPA" to "Construction, ARPA" may be necessary. Language similar to that contained in the Military Construction Appropriations Act for 1959 would accomplish this purpose without any increase in the President's budget. The Bureau of the Budget has agreed to this procedure. The transfer authority will be used as necessary to finance the ARPA authorization contained in title IV of the 1960 military construction authorization bill as passed by the House. The committees will be kept informed, as in the past, of all action taken under this transfer authority.

The total amount requested in this budget for all military construction appropriations is $1,188 million, or about $176 million less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1960. New obligational authority, direct obligations, and expenditures for each of the military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1961 are shown in attachment A.

Secretary Gates, in his appearance before the subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, discussed the major policy considerations entering into the development of the fiscal year 1961 defense program and budget. He also described the general approach to that budget and the manner in which the various agencies of the Department of Defense participated in the formulation of the program.

Roughly half of the military construction appropriations request for the coming fiscal year is in direct support and is an integral part of the weapon systems programs. Therefore, this portion of the construction budget is directly related to decisions made on weapon systems. For example, the decision to expand the ATLAS program from 9 to 13 squadrons automatically increased the requirement for construction funds. Similarly, the decision to harden some of the ATLAS facilities also increased the construction fund requirements.

As a matter of procedure, this portion of the military construction program is reviewed as part and parcel of the weapons system pro-

grams together with the procurement and research, development, test and evaluation portions of the system. Obviously, careful attention must be given to properly phasing the construction program in balance with the other two elements of the weapons systems, taking into account the differences in leadtime. This is not always an easy matter. Because of the technical complexities of modern weapons systems, some unanticipated delays are inevitable and some imbalances are bound to appear from time to time. But these imbalances are corrected as soon as possible.

The other half of the military appropriations request—for the maintenance, improvement, and modernization of the existing physical plant—are related to force levels, deployments, numbers of military personnel, numbers of installations and so forth. Here, the individual line items must be reviewed in relation to such considerations as existing facilities, the urgency of the need, the standards required, and the level of maintenance deemed appropriate.

In all cases, cost estimates are carefully reviewed against past experience, price and wage trends, and other standards.

We believe the budget requests for construction are well balanced, properly phased, and fiscally sound.

As of December 31, 1959, approximately 34 percent of the funds planned for obligation during the current fiscal year had been obligated. This is about the same proportion of the program obligated in the first 6 months of the last fiscal year. Although the amount yet to be obligated during the remainder of the current fiscal year may appear high, the military departments assure us that the program will be obligated as planned, leaving an unobligated balance at the end of fiscal year 1960 of approximately $747 million.

As the committee is aware, the Air Force's ATLAS program has been considerably expanded. This has necessitated a realinement of the construction program for that weapons system. This realinement has been completed and as the ATLAS construction contract awards get underway, it is anticipated that the last 3 months of this fiscal year will show a substantial increase in the rate of Air Force obligations for construction.

The unobligated balance of $747 million, together with the $1,188 million of new obligational authority requested for fiscal year 1961, provide a total of over $1.9 billion available for obligation in the coming fiscal year. Against this total availability, it is planned to obligate $1,382 million in 1961 leaving an unobligated but committed balance of about $550 million to be carried into fiscal year 1962. This unobligated balance is considered reasonable in the light of the size and character of the military construction program which lies ahead.

The Army and Navy have reduced their unobligated balances to a point where, in our opinion, any further reduction would not permit those two Departments to carry on their work during the first 2 or 3 months of the next fiscal year until the new appropriations become available. In the case of the Air Force, a larger unobligated balance is required to be carried over into 1961 in support of the large commitments which are expected to exist by the end of the current fiscal year. The unobligated balances, with the exception of those amounts required for going work, are supported by specific line items.

As the committee knows, the military construction appropriations are now on a fully funded basis and, consequently, the funds appro-

priated by the Congress for fiscal year 1960 in these appropriations are committed for specific line items. Therefore, any funds which may remain unobligated at the end of the current fiscal year are still required for projects already approved, and are not available for new projects in the coming fiscal year.

As in the past, if for any reason there is a change in the approved program and funds become available to meet new requirements, both this committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee will be advised and approval will be requested before these funds are applied to new projects.

In connection with reprograming, we recognize that there has been a rather large volume of reprograming actions during the current fiscal year. It should be recognized that fiscal year 1960 is a rather special case in that we entered fiscal year 1960 with an appreciable backlog of previously approved projects for which funds were not available. This situation has forced the military departments to keep under constant review all prior year programs in order to assure financing of the higher priority programs, regardless of the year of approval. Where fiscal year 1959 and prior year projects were deemed to be of higher priority than 1960 projects, the 1960 projects were dropped or deferred and the funds applied to the prior year projects. These reprograming actions, of course, were submitted to the Appropriations Committees for approval before they were implemented.

In developing the fiscal year 1961 military construction programs, all prior year projects, as well as the projects proposed for the coming fiscal year, were thoroughly reevaluated in order of priority. For that reason, we believe the number of reprograming actions in 1961 will be substantially lower. However, because of the rapid rate of technological developments and changes in the international situation the program must be frequently adjusted. It is our policy to hold program changes to a minimum.

Although the military departments will discuss their programs in detail before the committee, I believe it is worth pointing out that the facility requirements of our retaliatory forces will again be a major item in the military construction program. Funds requested for Air Force military construction will complete substantially the funding of the 13 Atlas squadrons approved and will complete the financing of the first 10 of the 14 Titan squadrons. Funds were also included in the 1961 budget request for the first operational facilities for the Minuteman.

With respect to air defense, the funds requested in the 1961 budget will substantially complete the facilities part of the so-called Air Defense master plan, as revised. In contrast to prior years the 1961 funds are essentially to improve further the existing radar systems and to complete the Super Combat Centers of the Sage system as reflected in the master plan. These amounts are smaller than they have been in earlier years.

There is one other area that is deserving of special mention and that is the improvement and modernization of the existing physical plant. Because of the requirements of higher priority programs, the proportion of military construction funds devoted to such improvement has not been sufficient to keep up with the deterioration experienced in some locations. The fiscal year 1961 program provides a somewhat larger proportion of funds for this purpose than in prior years. We hope to continue to devote a larger share of available

construction funds in future years to the replacement and modernization of existing facilities.

This problem is closely related to that of utilizing existing facilities in lieu of new construction and to the disposal of unneeded facilities. I understand Assistant Secretary Bryant intends to discuss this problem with the committee.

Last year Mr. McNeil brought to the attention of this committee the matter of mortgage insurance payments to the FHA in connection with defense housing programs. The basic law authorizing the Wherry housing program required the Department of Defense to pay a fixed fee to the FHA for mortgage insurance on the Wherry housing program. Last year the Congress modified the law so as to permit the FHA Commissioner to reduce the insurance premium. Although the Defense Department has requested the FHA to take the necessary action to reduce this premium, no relief has yet been forthcoming and the Department of Defense will be obliged to continue to pay premiums for mortgage insurance on properties belonging to the Government. In fiscal year 1961 it is estimated that these premiums will total $2.5 million on mortgages for Wherry housing units acquired by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, I have been in this job only a little more than 3 months. Consequently, I have purposely restricted my remarks this morning to the highlights of the fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation request. The witnesses that follow me will testify in detail on the content of the programs. However, I will be glad, with the assistance of my associates who are here with me today, to try to answer any general questions you may have.

(The following was submitted for the record:)

Military construction appropriations, fiscal years 1959–61

[Millions of dollars]

	New obligational authority			Direct obligations			Expenditures		
	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY									
Military construction, Army	230	264	209	240	272	212	374	255	252
Military construction, Army Reserve	6	20	12	24	23	12	45	22	18
Military construction, Army National Guard	------	23	8	15	15	20	------	15	15
Military construction, Army (special foreign currency program)	------	------	2	------	------	2	------	------	1
Construction, Alaska Communication System, Army	------	------	------	(1)	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total, Army	236	307	231	279	311	246	419	292	286
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY									
Military construction, Navy	295	204	190	343	225	191	326	286	238
Military construction, Naval Reserve	8	9	4	11	11	7	13	11	8
Military construction, Navy (special foreign currency program)	------	------	3	------	------	3	------	------	1
Total, Navy	303	213	197	354	236	201	339	297	247
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE									
Military construction, Air Force	785	777	725	1,074	899	880	1,128	1,020	774
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	------	4	4	------	4	4	------	1	4
Military construction, Air National Guard	11	16	7	11	16	7	28	13	12
Military construction, Air Force (special foreign currency program)	------	------	4	------	------	4	------	------	1
Total, Air Force	796	797	740	1,085	919	895	1,156	1,034	791

See footnotes at end of table, p. 6.

Military construction appropriations, fiscal years 1959–61—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

	New obligational authority			Direct obligations			Expenditures		
	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE									
Loran stations, DOD	20	23	20	20	23	20	20	23	20
Military construction, Advanced Research Projects Agency, DOD	28	24	------	9	8	20	3	13	10
Military construction, foreign countries, DOD	------	------	------	------	------	------	7	8	5
Olympic winter games, DOD	------	------	------	------	------	------	3	1	------
Access roads, DOD	------	------	------	------	------	------	2	2	(1)
Family housing, DOD	------	------	------	------	------	------	(1)	(1)	------
Total, OSD	48	47	20	29	31	40	34	47	35
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, TOTAL									
Active Forces	1,358	1,291	1,153	1,687	1,428	1,332	1,862	1,608	1,302
Reserve Forces	26	73	35	61	69	50	86	62	57
Total	1,384	1,364	1,188	1,748	1,497	1,382	1,948	1,670	1,359

[1] Less than $500,000.

NOTE.—Amounts for fiscal year 1959 have been adjusted for comparability with fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

VALIDITY OF REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS

What certification can you give us as to the validity of the requirements and costs of the individual items in this bill?

Mr. LINCOLN. As you know, and as I have said in my statement, the construction program is divided into two different categories.

One has to do, of course, with supplementing the weapons systems. They were very carefully gone over by all of the services at the time the particular weapons systems were approved, and consequently I would say the construction portion of those systems are fairly well defined. Of course I realize you may run into a situation, as has been the case in the past, where a weapons system may later be abandoned or reduced in scope. In such cases, and following our past practices, this committee is informed.

With reference to the other half of the program, I must say our office has gone over it as carefully as we can with the staff of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Properties and Installations. I understand there has been a careful review by Mr. Poole and other people in our office working with the staff of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Properties and Installations and they too, should be on a firm basis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many times has this presentation been rereviewed by your staff?

Mr. LINCOLN. Are you talking about my statement, or what I have just said?

Mr. SHEPPARD. What you have just said, and what your staff may have said, because I assume there have been a series of examinations covering the total.

Mr. LINCOLN. It has been going on for months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. About how many times would you say the review has taken place?

Mr. LINCOLN. There have been two complete reviews, and, of course there have been reappraisals, day by day, on certain items. There have been two reviews by our staff.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As a result of the reviews made by your staff, in conjunction with Mr. Bryant's organization, how many deletions have been made, and what have been the results of them dollarwise?

Mr. LINCOLN. I cannot answer that. Perhaps Mr. Poole can.

Mr. POOLE. I do not have the exact numbers with me, but we can provide them for the record if the committee desires.

Generally speaking, the Air Force submitted to us a list of items in excess of $1 billion. In preliminary discussions with them, we isolated the areas we agreed on, and we arrived at a markup figure considerably less than that. However, the record will indicate only a program adjustment in the vicinity of $20 million, or $25 million.

The original list from the Army that came to us was close to $300 million. Similarly with the Army the first reductions were staff agreements, you might say, isolating areas and coming into agreements. The official reductions that went on the record will show something around $10 million.

The Navy was more conservative. Their list was something around $240 million and we came into agreement on most of the items with the exception of something like $5 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I take it from your statement, Mr. Lincoln, this program is very well tied into the latest plans and thinking; is that correct?

Mr. LINCOLN. That is correct. As you know these programs are under constant review. As of this date I know of nothing that is contrary to what we are presenting to you this morning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What about the air defense situation.

Mr. LINCOLN. As I understand it the air defense situation at the present time is under review. I attempted before I left this morning to see if there had been any proposals made in concrete form, or if there was anything to present to you. They told me "no"; they were still under study. There has been no decision made.

The Air Force I believe is working on a program now to present to the Secretary, but it has not been put in final form. As you know the Secretary is at a NATO meeting and will be there for 2 weeks. That is what I had in mind when I said if there is a change you will know about it promptly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any items in the bill which have not been unequivocally approved by the services and all reviewing agencies in DOD and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. LINCOLN. To my knowledge there is not, and I checked that point very carefully with Mr. Poole this morning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any items in the program which require authorization which were not contained in the military construction authorization bill recently passed by the House?

Mr. LINCOLN. There are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are they, and how many?

Mr. LINCOLN. I cannot give you the numbers but I can give you the dollars, and, if the chairman would like, I will submit the line items. As I understand it the House Armed Services Committee reduced the services' requests as follows:

For the Army, $11,128,000.

For the Navy, $22,511,000.

For the Air Force, $27,485,000.

Now in the bill that is before this committee the services have nevertheless presented the following amounts which have not been included in the bill passed by the House.

For the Army, items totaling $3,628,000.

For the Navy, items totaling $13,320,000.

I do not have a breakdown of those amounts on a line item basis, but I will be happy to supply you one.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would supply a breakdown for the record.

Mr. POOLE. The action of the House with respect to the passage of the authorization request deleted all the items for the Natick Quartermaster Laboratory in the amount of $3,628,000 That is in the Army title. In the Navy title, the Naval Station, Washington area was deleted. Our request here for that is $13,320,000.

Mr. LINCOLN. Those are the two items.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Mr. SHEPPARD. How valid do you consider the budget estimate of unobligated balances for end of fiscal year 1960 and 1961?

Mr. LINCOLN. As I understand it, we can certify it as being accurate and firm for fiscal year 1960, and fiscal year 1961 is our best estimate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are any military construction funds unapportioned at the present time?

Mr. LINCOLN. There are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much?

Mr. LINCOLN. I will be happy to read this into the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may put that in the record.

(The requested information follows:)

Apportionment status—Unapportioned balances as of Mar. 15, 1960

[In thousands of dollars]

Appropriation	Total availability	Unapportioned balance
Military construction, Army	$378,180	$50,146
Military construction, Navy	322,797	3,628
Military construction, Air Force	1,420,902	58,212
Military construction, Army Reserve	25,105	583
Military construction, Naval Reserve	18,628	2,568
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	4,000	
Military construction, Army National Guard	30,180	13,804
Military construction, Air National Guard	16,440	400
Department of Defense, Loran stations	23,200	
Military construction, Advanced Research Projects Agency, DOD	39,513	22,443

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have all of the funds available for fiscal year 1960 been placed against specific line items?

Mr. LINCOLN. They have, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year we discussed with Secretary McNeil the cleaning up of various pockets of money existing in the several district offices. What has been done about this?

Mr. LINCOLN. Mr. McNeil apparently, as was his custom, took some action on that with the result that substantial funds were cleaned up. For example, the Air Force was able, by removing some of these

pockets of money, to get about $180 million for the ATLAS program. As I understand, small savings were also generated in the other two services' accounts. It is a constant process, as you know, and we intend to do the same thing this year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your evaluation of the effect of the 100-percent-funding policy on this program?

Mr. LINCOLN. I personally like it. I understand that Secretary McNeil did also. It not only reduces reprograming, but it helps the Department of Defense and the Congress to know where we are going on these different programs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will give you a better idea of your total?

Mr. LINCOLN. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does it expedite, generally speaking, the functions you are called upon to perform?

Mr. LINCOLN. Very much so, and it gives us a much better tool for fiscal management.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What reviews have you made of the Capehart housing program, including the provision for the construction of so-called community facilities with mortgage proceeds?

Mr. LINCOLN. I discussed this briefly with Mr. Bryant's people and I understand the staff of our respective offices have made a thorough review on it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record at this point a table showing the total liability for Capehart and Wherry housing as of end fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961.

(The information requested follows:)

Total liability for Capehart and Wherry housing

	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961
Capehart housing: Mortgage indebtedness, end of period	$521,993,465	$1,103,330,410	$1,444,852,592
Wherry housing:			
Current liabilities	3,442,494	10,742,494	10,000,000
Mortgage and equities	437,579,493	495,279,493	534,279,493
Total liabilities, Wherry	441,021,987	506,021,987	544,279,493

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the program that you have reviewed here carry so-called community facilities with mortgage proceeds at all?

Mr. LINCOLN. As the chairman knows, the Comptroller's Office has taken the position, which is the position of this committee, that we do not approve using mortgage proceeds for facilities, and I understand that is not contemplated in this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your experience with reference to the acquisition of Wherry housing by condemnation as compared to negotiations? I want you to be very careful about that question because it is loaded.

Mr. LINCOLN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I see that it is. I have a chart here that I will be happy to present to the committee. Having practiced law myself, it seems to me the way to do it is not to let these cases get into court because the awards of the courts are far above what the services could negotiate, and should negotiate, so we are very conscious of that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The record has clearly indicated, when you look at the situation across the entire picture, that somebody has tried to make themselves look good by the arbitrary concept and that we are walking into something here that will be a very costly operation. There should be a roundtable conference to get this thing straightened out so we can get these negotiations cleaned up and keep away from the litigation. The courts have made a considerable number of adjudications where they have taken the opposite view and increased the value.

Mr. LINCOLN. I was shocked to see some of the records.

USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what extent can you assure the committee that this program makes the maximum economical use of existing facilities?

Mr. LINCOLN. We try to give it a thorough review, but I am not satisfied that we have the system to do it, or the manpower. We work with Secretary Bryant's group. We both know the problem and we are working on it. We have checked it to the best of our ability. Frankly I have not had an opportunity to go into that problem as far as I would like.

PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record a table showing small business participation in the military construction program and comment on the proposal made last year with reference to further set-asides for small business.

Mr. LINCOLN. I might say here from my own knowledge that I have investigated this and I find that actually the services are giving a large part of the construction business to small-business people. I will be happy to supply the figures for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. During your reviews in this particular field, has there been any instance that you know of, or your staff, where the set-aside is becoming somewhat of an expensive luxury, or is that conspicuous by its absence?

Mr. POOLE. I would like to go back to the situation we were in last year. Last year we were in a position, you might say, where we might have been directed by the Small Business Administration to set aside a certain portion of our construction for small business. Fortunately our records indicated that such an action was not necessary because a very large percentage of all our construction was handled by so-called small business. Incidentally, in the construction field a small business by definition is one which does $500,000 of work or less in a year. If you will recall last year we gave you some figures which showed a very large portion of all our construction was handled by those kinds of construction firms. This year we are experiencing the same thing. On that basis the Small Business Administration did not direct us to set aside anything, and as of right now we have no such thing as set-asides in our construction programs.

I have in my hand a table entitled "Military Construction Contract Awards, Dollar Volume to Small Business, Fiscal Year 1959." With the committee's permission I would like to have this table made a part of the record as it clearly shows the picture.

(The table referred to follows:)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AWARDS

Dollar volume to small business, fiscal year 1959

[Amounts in millions]

Contracting agency and service	Total amount	Small business	
		Amount	Percent of total
Department of the Army, Chief, Corps of Engineers, Army and Air Force	$836.1	$444.2	53.1
Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy	262.8	216.0	82.2
Total	1,098.9	660.2	60.1

Contract actions to small business, fiscal year 1959

	Percent
Army and Air Force	74.8
Navy	96.5

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any reporting system in connection with the awarding of contracts to small business through set-asides which will show that method is more costly than the normal procedure?

Mr. POOLE. We have no report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have no checkup from small business on that aspect?

Mr. POOLE. No. From our discussions with both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks we find their considered opinion and judgment is that if they had "set-asides" the way the Small Business Administration originally intended, it would have cost us more money. We might have had to split contracts to make them the right size, so to speak.

USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been done on the problem of utilizing your facilities? What is the story so far as your office knows it?

Mr. LINCOLN. My staff works with Assistant Secretary Bryant's people on all these problems. I understand Mr. Bryant has attempted to make a more careful survey of that. From my own investigation here I find that the Department of Defense—and perhaps it is just inherent in the problem—has to rely on the services and their certification as to facilities because they tell me that to investigate each particular installation with personnel from the Office of the Secretary of Defense would be just impossible.

However, our office has an audit division and an inspection group—a very small one—and we do go out and make spot checks. As I understand it, we have done that in the past and have obtained information on some of the installations so that when the proposals came up from the services we were able to take some healthy action.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It gives you an opportunity to spot check their presentations?

Mr. LINCOLN. It does, sir.

Mr. SIKES. (Off the record.)

(Discussion off the record.)

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the report accompanying the fiscal year 1960 bill, the committee pointed out the need for a thorough review of the access-road program. To what extent did your office participate in this study and what were the results thereof?

Mr. LINCOLN. As I understand it, we work closely with Secretary Bryant's office and have insisted before any of this type of thing is put in the budget, or ever submitted, that the proposed construction has a definite location. Again, there still remains a lot to be done; there is no question about it. We have to do more on that type of thing.

Mr. POOLE. This year we insisted that the backup for the dollar request for access roads in our three services' programs must have gone through all the preliminary steps necessary. I am sure this committee knows this requirement is generated at the installation level. It goes through the commands, comes up through the three Departments, and then it goes to the Chief of Transportation who certifies the need to the Public Roads Administration. This year we have insisted that whatever items are in our programs go through those steps. With respect to the cost estimates, the Bureau of Public Roads has made the preliminary surveys, and some estimates then are at a point where you can make a fairly good decision as to what to include in the program. There is one exception; that is in our missile program.

(Discussion off the record.)

STANDARDIZATION OF FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year the committee also pointed out the need for the standardization of family housing in and between the several services. What has been done in this respect?

Mr. LINCOLN. There again Secretary Bryant has made a study. I have been talking to Mr. Poole and he tells me they actually had some architects come in and study all the different types of housing throughout the country in an effort to work out a set of standards.

Mr. POOLE. The architect-engineers have made a report, and the report has been provided to the services, as well as guidelines for new housing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you seen the report yourself?

Mr. POOLE. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will be interesting when that report is made available to see whether or not they have done that on a countrywide approach, or whether they have done it on a geographical approach. It is clear in trying to draw across the country percentages in functions of this character you walk into trouble. Why? You have high and low factors that you deal with, so far as expenditures are concerned. Even in the rehabilitation of properties you cannot do it on an across-the-country basis. You have to live under what you have.

FUNDS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

How close do you gentlemen get to actually a shakedown on your research and development funds?

Mr. LINCOLN. You are talking about the construction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, I am talking about the whole situation, covering the picture as a whole, having to do with R. & D. aspects.

Mr. LINCOLN. As you know, Secretary McNeil last year thought the only way to control that would be to break out the "Research, [and] development, test, and evaluation" appropriations from the others and we have been in the process of doing that.

We find that we have more accurate figures as to what is going into R. & D. Until we had the figures broken out from the other appropriations, we did not have any very satisfactory way to analyze the problem. We have worked very closely and I am trying to work on even a closer basis with Dr. York.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As a matter of precise bookkeeping, do you not feel that the more additives you put into R. & D., such as test and evaluation, for example, creates arbitrarily a pyramiding of the concept of the money that goes into the fund and the more "cats and dogs" you toss in merely escalate the pyramiding of the situation?

Mr. LINCOLN. It can very well result in that if you do not control it from a budgetary standpoint.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is your system in the office such that you can break out the difference between expenditures for R. & D. and that of test and evaluation as such?

Mr. LINCOLN. We are trying to do that. There again we have discussed the general problem that I think the chairman has in mind; that is, perhaps the appropriation should be broken in half, to have one for R. & D. and another for test and evaluation. We are studying that at the moment. I know Secretary McNeil's thought was to put those all together and get them out of the "Procurement" appropriation. It may be that the next step will be to put them back into two. At the moment, we feel that it is better to have them in one because the other appropriations are not clear of those four items at the moment.

We are still in the process of identifying certain items and transferring them. I would say by the end of this year we should have a pretty clear picture. We are aware of the problem you are talking about. I hope that by the end of this year we will have something concrete to offer along those lines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking and as a matter of function in your office, and this is your responsibility so far as I see it, do you feel that wherever line items can be broken out so they stand on their own feet and on their own justification, that you are in better shape to consider and evaluate them, and also the Congress is in better shape to do that?

Mr. LINCOLN. There is no question about that. I agree with that principle. The only question is whether you make two appropriations out of them.

Basically, those four items should actually be broken out. That is the next step; having taken them from the other broad appropriation categories to divide them into four separate groups, within the larger appropriation, "Research, development, test, and evaluation."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Originally, before they are pulled out, they were put in procurement, were they not?

Mr. LINCOLN. A large part of them were. Some of them were "Construction" and even "Operation and maintenance."

Mr. LAIRD. There wasn't any construction?

Mr. LINCOLN. No, for the research and development is what I had in mind.

Mr. POOLE. Facilities, as such, were always identified specifically in the "Construction" portion, except those financed from "Procurement" and other things.

FUNDS FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before I leave the interrogation, I have one more question.

Just how much additional work, and what would be the real problem presented to you if there is a problem of a separation between your maintenance and operation funds from your point of view?

Mr. LINCOLN. I frankly couldn't answer that question. I haven't thought about it enough. I do not know whether the rest of our group here has any thoughts on that, but if they don't, I will do some thinking about it and have our group think about it.

Do you have something, Mr. Logan?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, this has been a matter that we have discussed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It won't be that much longer out of this committee. I will tell you that right now.

Let me tell you why I refer to this. When Congress adjourned this last time there we covered a tremendous amount of military installations, sometimes by my staff assistant, Mr. Sanders, sometimes by myself, but we covered this thing together. With the combination of those funds I go back to the basic philosophy I just interjected about research and development. We are running into a tremendous amount of diminishing return in this field. Why?

Under this type budget operation I can well understand what is going on. The soft spot is always to reach over and take your maintenance money and apply it to operations as long as you have those privileges.

When you look over the properties that we are still maintaining, and so far as I know want to continue to maintain, your diminishing return is very evident in many of them, which means that ultimately because of the opportunity to take these funds back and forth, as it were, it is not proving out what I call good economy, so far as the taxpayer is concerned. If you have something to tell me, go ahead. We will be very glad to hear it.

Mr. LOGAN. The only thing I have is something to add to what you have just mentioned. What we try to do is to review the installation picture as to its mission. One of the dangers in setting out a separate pot of money for the maintenance of facilities is that you get to the point, possibly, where facilities are being maintained as an end item objective rather than the mission that the facility is supposed to perform.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How has that ideosyncrasy developed to that degree? In other words, you establish mission requirements that are clearly spelled out among the different fields. You should have a determination in that field of what should be done and how long

installations are going to be maintained. You have to have the first premise to utilize the latter one. Is that true?

Mr. LOGAN. That is true. We have felt up to now that by doing this in the same appropriation that we would get a better balance between the operation of the facility and the maintenance.

One of our big problems, Mr. Chairman, as you know, is the maintenance of facilities that may not be in our picture for a long haul. There is always a tendency, until you are sure about the long-range mission of this installation, to defer the maintenance. This is true at the installation level, at the service level, and at the Office of the Secretary of Defense level.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Just because it is true in that percentage does not necessarily make it a correct procedure, does it?

Mr. LOGAN. No. It does not. One of the other problems, and you are familiar with this one, is the problem of defining maintenance versus operations. We have had that difficulty in connection with the so-called deferred maintenance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you not suppose as long as we have had a good many ad hoc committees going into the matter we should bring them here for advisory purposes? It might be well to get an insight into that type of mentality, we should bring them in and sit them down and let them state the difference between paint and some other things.

Mr. LOGAN. I think that could be done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Sikes?

CONSTRUCTION FUNDS FOR ATLAS AND POLARIS MISSILES

Mr. SIKES. Are you in position, Mr. Secretary, to tell us what the additional cost for each ATLAS squadron would be insofar as construction money is concerned if the Congress should decide to add still other ATLAS squadrons?

Mr. LINCOLN. Do you mean the overall cost of the ATLAS installed?

Mr. SIKES. I am speaking only of construction money. You say there is additional ATLAS money in here. How much is figured per squadron?

Mr. LINCOLN. Approximately $50 million for construction alone.

Mr. POOLE. The $50 million estimate is for a "one by nine" configuration, hardened.

Mr. LAIRD. What was the cost of the "three by three"?

Mr. POOLE. "Three by three," Mr. Laird? We are not building any of those. Unhardened "three by three," sites cost around $28 million. Some of the things we did with the "three by three" we would not do again.

Mr. SIKES. Would there be any additional construction costs involved if the Congress were to appropriate for additional POLARIS submarines?

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Sikes, if the POLARIS submarines go to 15 or more, there is no question that the Navy will have to have some additional shore facilities. It is quite possible we might have another Charleston Base. We have shore facilities to support the POLARIS submarine at Charleston now. In other words, we would have to have another base similar to Charleston.

Mr. SIKES. If there are more than 15?

Mr. POOLE. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. How many will we have if we appropriate for those that are requested this year?

Mr. LINCOLN. We requested 12 fully funded and long leadtime items on 3 more, or 15.

Mr. SIKES. If we go beyond the presently planned program we will have to plan for another base?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What would be a rough estimate of the anticipated first year money for such an additional base?

Mr. POOLE. Around $10 million.

Mr. SIKES. What would be the total cost of such additional base if it were comparable to the Charleston base?

Mr. POOLE. If it is auxiliary to another existing base, I would say the total cost would be something like $15 or $18 million, depending on existing facilities, utilities, and that kind of thing.

If it is a brand new base, it will run considerably more money.

Mr. SIKES. Twice as much?

Mr. POOLE. I would say so; yes, sir.

CHANGES IN CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. There seems to have been a considerable number of changes in your construction program during the current fiscal year. It is difficult for this committee to understand how it is that the services can make a very firm statement to this committee and to the authorizing committee about your requirements and yet within a matter of months you are back for reallocations, cancellations, and changes generally. How can that be? You should know more about your requirements than to have to be changing the construction program within a few months after it has been approved and funded.

Mr. LINCOLN. Well, Mr. Sikes, I think you are right. They tell me that one reason there were so many reprogramings last year was because of this "full funding" concept that was just going in.

In other words, they had a number of line items that were not funded as yet and therefore, in order to get some of them which they felt had higher priority than those that were fully funded, they had to reprogram. They assure me that that rate of reprograming will decrease measurably in the coming fiscal year, due to this "full funding" concept that the chairman and I discussed before. However, I agree with you that we should keep reprogramings to a minimum. It does not make much sense to come up here with a specific program one day and then a month later change it.

However, they advise me that it is the nature of the problem, resulting from rapid technological developments and that type of thing. However, reprograming means more paperwork for the Department of Defense as well as for the Congress, and to the extent that we can diminish that, we should, and we will try to do so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am wondering whether or not, based on the question propounded by Mr. Sikes a moment ago, that the change in the so-called system is an influencing factor that creates this shifting later on?

In other words, you start out with system "X" and maybe you get to the testing category. As a result of the testing that takes place with "X" missile, certain refinements have to be made. Something has to be added to it, and that has an indirect influence upon the factors of the whole program. I mean from its very inception on down.

Mr. LINCOLN. That is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you put the system in that is where the problem has its origin; is that right?

Mr. LINCOLN. I think you are right, Mr. Chairman. Take the ATLAS. They started out with a "one by three" soft base, then they came up with "one by nine," and they are even talking about making it more. It is that type of problem.

Mr. SIKES. As of now, March 21, is the 1960 program firm?

This is the last month in the third quarter of fiscal 1960. There have been a number of changes made as of this period. Is the 1960 program now firm or is there still to be a change in the fiscal year 1960 program?

Mr. LINCOLN. To my knowledge it is firm.

I asked that very question, but again I suppose if there is some unusual breakthrough or change, we will have to reprogram. I have asked that question and they said no, that as of today's date it was firm, and they knew of, and I know of, nothing that would change that.

Mr. SIKES. If you do not need a facility, you should make program changes at any time you find this is true. Warfare changes and military facility requirements change. I know that.

Mr. JONAS. Will you yield, Mr. Sikes?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Is this not usually the way it happens: You find, following the hearing, a new requirement, and you think it is of a higher priority than almost anything in the program and when you come in with a change request, you have found something that you think is less important to do and you are trying to meet those two situations?

Mr. LINCOLN. That is right, sir. That certainly explains a good part of it.

Mr. JONAS. You do not usually reverse that process and decide to change something just to change it. I mean, as I review most of them, I think you usually find yourself in the position of discovering another important need and you are trying to find some way of balancing it out or find the money for it in some project of a lower priority.

Mr. LINCOLN. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. Have you been told to anticipate a change in the air defense program that would affect the disposition of fiscal year 1960 money?

Mr. POOLE. If I may answer that, there will be two additional changes, Mr. Sikes. If you will recall, we were going to build two batteries per SAC base. Two of the bases were going to be at Davis-Monthan and Vandenberg. After a second look or third look, JCS decided they do not need it there, but would rather take those batteries and put them in four cities. This change has not come to the attention of this committee yet.

Mr. SIKES. Have you been alerted to the possibility of changes in the air defense program in this or previous appropriations due to changes in BOMARC?

Mr. POOLE. The BOMARC program has no money in this appropriation, Mr. Sikes. The committee is aware, of course, that we have stopped the construction of the last 3 of the 15. In other words, we have not apportioned money for the last 3 of the 15.

Mr. SIKES. When was that done?

Mr. POOLE. About a month ago.

POSTPONEMENT OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OBLIGATIONS

Mr. SIKES. Is all of the money which was appropriated for fiscal year 1960 to be obligated during fiscal year 1960?

Mr. POOLE. No, sir. We will obligate against the total available. In other words, we will obligate old and new. The unobligated balance estimate in the Army of $97 million, for instance, will be old and new.

Mr. SIKES. How much of this failure to obligate money is due to the policy of postponing military construction until the last part of the fiscal year in order to keep the budget picture looking as good as possible as long as possible?

Mr. LINCOLN. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. We appropriate money because presumably it is needed at once for the military program. We cannot understand why appropriations are not apportioned for spending until the fourth quarter of the fiscal year. Is there any comment?

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to get the answer for the record.

Mr. LINCOLN. The only comment I can make on that from my own limited knowledge is this. They advise me that it is the nature of construction work that they withhold letting the contracts until the weapons systems pass the test and evaluation stage. Only after they know that they are going ahead with its production, do they let the construction contracts.

Mr. SIKES. It is not a very orderly program. Much of the construction money is in no way related to weapons tests and evaluation.

Mr. LINCOLN. Dollarwise, I do not know what the effect is. That is one answer I received when I asked that question.

The other reason given was this: In the nature of things, it takes time on a construction project to let the contracts and do all of the other things necessary before actually obligating the funds.

Mr. SIKES. Do you call a delay in building a chapel until the fourth quarter something that has to do with weapons tests systems?

Mr. LINCOLN. No, sir. I did not mean to imply that. I said it is part of the reason for those projects connected with weapons systems.

Mr. SIKES. Has anyone attempted to identify the increased cost which has come about because of higher prices for construction which result in this policy of delaying expenditure of funds until late in the fiscal year?

Mr. LINCOLN. No, no one has. I think we probably all hope that expenditures are going down. I do not think that is going to be the fact.

Mr. SIKES. They haven't gone down over a period of a good many years. The reverse has been true. I suspect we spend several million dollars a year more for construction as a result of this policy of waiting out military construction. Can you comment on that?

Mr. LINCOLN. I frankly do not have the answers, Mr. Sikes. Anything I would say would be just an opinion, not based on facts at all.

Mr. SIKES. We are not trying to belabor you on this Mr. Secretary. You are new here and much of this will have to be answered in detail later by other witnesses who have had more direct responsibility.

Please understand we are not blaming you for previous policies.

Mr. LINCOLN. I appreciate that, sir.

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. As I have indicated previously, I am very concerned about the construction of bases that we find are not needed when they are finished. Very soon we are told that you are going to have to close bases in the Air Force and in the Navy as a result of scheduled cutbacks.

Has anyone alerted you to the prospect that this may result in a situation where you are completing some bases, only to close others in the same service within the same time period?

Mr. LINCOLN. Well, all I can say to that, Mr. Chairman, is that I know our people are aware of the problem and are working with Mr. Bryant's office in that connection. He has the more direct responsibility, but certainly we also should watch it closely, and, as I understand it, we are attempting to follow through carefully on that.

Mr. SIKES. Prior to my conversation with you this morning, in this committee, has anyone alerted you to this problem?

Mr. LINCOLN. As such, no; other than talking to my own staff about the problem. We have discussed it.

Mr. SIKES. It seems the services themselves would have picked this up long ago and would have made an effort to avoid this possible duplication of facilities. Apparently they have not.

Mr. LINCOLN. They may have. I have no knowledge of it. They may be doing that very thing.

INSURANCE FOR WHERRY AND CAPEHART HOUSING PROGRAMS

Mr. SIKES. I am surprised to note that the Federal Housing Administration has failed to give relief to the services that Congress provided by law 6 months ago, or longer. This is costing the Department of Defense considerable money, is it not?

Mr. LINCOLN. It is, sir. We are disturbed about it. I have been talking to our people about it and to Mr. Bryant. We find a formal request was made. The FHA asked for additional information, but no decision has been made.

Mr. SIKES. Can you estimate the cost per year for a delay of this kind?

Mr. LINCOLN. It would be $2 to $3 million a year at the present rate.

Mr. POOLE. In 1961 it will cost us for insurance $2½ million for the Wherry program and approximately $1 million to $1½ million for the Capehart program, You see, in the Capehart we pay a quarter of 1 percent, whereas in the Wherry we pay about one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is a very significant thing.

The Secretary has rendered a service in calling to our attention the fact that FHA has delayed in issuing the necessary rulings which were authorized by Congress in legislation many months ago and the delay is costing the Department of Defense several million dollars a year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Jonas?

STATUS OF FUNDS

Mr. JONAS. You say through December 31, 1959, only approximately 34 percent of the funds were obligated, leaving a sizable majority of the funds unobligated as of that date?

Mr. LINCOLN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JONAS. What can you say generally about any slowdown in construction of these new system sites for the ATLAS?

Mr. POOLE. There has been no slowdown of any of the scheduled contract awards for the ATLAS or TITAN sites, Mr. Jonas.

Mr. JONAS. Are they progressing according to plan this year?

Mr. POOLE. Yes, sir, they are.

Mr. JONAS. How many do we have under construction right now?

Mr. POOLE. We have seven ATLASES—I am trusting to memory, and what happened in the last month or so—and three TITANS.

Off the record.

(Duscussion off the record.)

Mr. JONAS. I have no other questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Laird?

CONSTRUCTION FOR ATLAS MISSILE

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Secretary, on your ATLAS construction, which you say in your statement "is fully funded" or substantially funded in this particular bill up through the 15th Squadron, am I to interpret your figure of $50 million as the military construction cost of the last six of those squadrons or the last four of those squadrons or where did that figure come from?

Mr. POOLE. $50 million each.

Mr. LAIRD. At what bases is that $50 million? Is that the last one?

Mr. POOLE. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. It certainly is not an average cost. I could not figure out where you pulled that out of the hat.

Mr. POOLE. For the last ones, the estimate is around $46 million. That is what we had for the last ones, $46 million apiece.

Mr. LINCOLN. For construction.

Mr. POOLE. For construction.

Mr. LAIRD. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. POOLE. In addition to that, as we said before, depending on where you put this particular site, you might have to have 2, 3, 4 million dollars for access roads.

Mr. LAIRD. So the last one cost you $50 million?

Mr. POOLE. That is right.

Mr. LAIRD. That is the 13th Squadron?

Mr. POOLE. The 13th Squadron.

Mr. LAIRD. What would the cost be if you increased the number of missiles from 9 to 15 at that site?

Mr. POOLE. It would be a complete guess.

Mr. LINCOLN. We would like to furnish that for the record.

Mr. LAIRD. You have not any figure on the increase in the size of the squadron from 9 to 15?

Mr. POOLE. We have not.

Mr. LINCOLN. We can get them for you.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to know the total cost to increase the Atlas squadrons from 9 missiles to 15 and to 12 in each of the last 5. Do you have it from 9 to 12?

Mr. POOLE. No. I don't have it with me. I have heard of numbers, but I do not want to give them as factual numbers.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. LAIRD. One other question: As far as Bomarc construction is concerned, there is no funding in the 1961 military construction budget for Bomarc construction?

Mr. LINCOLN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. How much is unexpended in that particular program?

Mr. POOLE. No obligations have been made, Mr. Laird, for the last three sites, approximately $5 million apiece, about $15 million. The unexpended total will depend on what we do on those that are under construction. One that is 50 percent complete, of course, will be more than another one that is only 10 or 20 percent complete.

Mr. LAIRD. Have you run any figures out on what savings there will be on that?

Mr. POOLE. We will save the whole $15 million cost of those sites that have not gone under construction and we might save from $200,000 to probably $1 million or $2 million apiece for the last four.

Mr. LINCOLN. We do not have any definite figures on them. We can try to get them, though.

Mr. POOLE. It will be cancellations and those are anybody's guess.

Mr. LINCOLN. That is right. It is a question of negotiating, with the contractor, a settlement figure.

Mr. LAIRD. That is all I have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Gentlemen, I would like to ask you, if you will, this year, to return the transcript and the inserts that you wish to supply for the record and get the record back as rapidly as you can. It will be very helpful. We have a rather difficult problem on our hands in expediting all appropriations. I am sure you understand. If you will put a little special effort into it this year, we will appreciate it very much.

Mr. LINCOLN. We would be happy to do that.

We appreciate your courtesy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much. You gentlemen have been very responsive to our interrogations and we appreciate it.

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

WITNESSES

HON. JOSEPH V. CHARYK, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
HON. LYLE S. GARLOCK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT)
LEWIS E. TURNER, OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT)
MAJ. GEN. AUGUSTUS M. MINTON, DIRECTOR OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH CALDARA, DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR SAFETY
MAJ. GEN. ROBERT J. FRIEDMAN, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET
MAJ. GEN. BRUCE K. HOLLOWAY, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS
MAJ. GEN. HEWITT I. WHELESS, DIRECTOR OF PLANS
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT H. CURTIN, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR REAL PROPERTY
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT E. GREER, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR GUIDED MISSILES
COL. WILLIAM E. LEONHARD, A. F. BALLISTIC MISSILE DIVISION
COL. WILLIAM H. PARKHILL, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
COL. MELVIN T. EDMONDS, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
JOHN R. GIBBENS, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
HERBERT SUFIT, DIRECTORATE OF BUDGET
ROBERT H. JENSEN, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
COL. HENRY J. STEHLING, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
COL. ROBERT L. LILES, DIRECTORATE OF OPERATIONS
COL. JACK C. CARMICHAEL, OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL
LYNN S. KINTER, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
COL. GEORGE H. CHASE, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, INTELLIGENCE
COL. PAUL P. DOUGLAS, JR., OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR SAFETY
COL. CHARLES A. STONE, DIRECTORATE OF MAINTENANCE ENGINEERING
COL. THEODORE H. RUNYON, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR GUIDED MISSILES
COL. GUY H. GOODARD, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
COL. F. K. NICHOLS, DIRECTORATE OF COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS
COL. RIO G. LUCAS, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
COL. GLENN A. KENT, DIRECTORATE OF PLANS
LT. COL. HERMAN DORFMAN, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR GUIDED MISSILES
LT. COL. MALCOLM M. ECKHARDT, DIRECTORATE OF MAINTENANCE ENGINEERING
LT. COL. LEONARD H. URBACH, DIRECTORATE OF MAINTENANCE ENGINEERING
LT. COL. V. J. VILLONE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, DEVELOPMENT

LT. COL. HERBERT HOOVER, A. F. BALLISTIC MISSILE DIVISION
LEONARD BALDINGER, DIRECTORATE OF BUDGET
CARL W. ANDERSON, DIRECTORATE OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
LT. COL. FREDERICK BOCKELMAN, JR., DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PROCUREMENT AND TRAINING
MAJ. FELIX B. WYWAL, DIRECTORATE OF PLANS

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct obligations:			
1. Public works construction	$963,440,427	$800,044,982	$795,000,000
2. Minor construction	16,878,473	15,000,000	15,000,000
3. Planning	64,307,770	55,000,000	45,000,000
4. Supporting activities	23,768,259	25,000,000	25,000,000
5. Reserve forces construction	5,595,454	3,955,018	
Total direct obligations	1,073,990,383	899,000,000	880,000,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
4. Supporting activities	5,501,966	4,000,000	5,000,000
Total obligations	1,079,492,349	903,000,000	885,000,000
Financing:			
Unobligated balance brought forward	−902,601,056	−633,894,667	−511,727,167
Advances and reimbursements from non-Federal sources (69 Stat. 646)	−5,501,966	−4,000,000	−5,000,000
Recovery of prior obligations	−20,283,994		
Unobligated balance carried forward	633,894,667	511,727,167	356,727,167
Appropriation (new obligating authority)	785,000,000	776,832,500	725,000,000
Department of the Air Force: Direct obligations:			
07 Other contractual services	64,307,770	55,000,000	45,000,000
10 Land and structures	918,945,712	730,943,999	740,112,800
Total direct obligations	983,253,482	785,943,999	785,112,800
Reimbursable obligations:			
07 Other contractual services	5,501,966	4,000,000	5,000,000
Total, Department of the Air Force	988,755,448	789,943,999	790,112,800
Allocation accounts:			
Total number of permanent positions	9,826	9,474	9,326
Full-time equivalent of all other positions	126	94	82
Average number of all employees	9,595	9,210	9,079
Number of employees at end of year	9,392	9,167	9,167
Average GS grade and salary	7.8 6,345	7.8 6,354	7.8 6,375
Average salary of ungraded positions	4,218	4,044	4,140
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions	58,381,427	56,359,244	56,005,332
Positions other than permanent	603,312	457,000	386,000
Other personal services	4,648,613	4,316,756	4,098,868
Total personal services	63,633,352	61,133,000	60,490,200
02 Travel	16,727	13,000	13,000
03 Transportation of things	1		
04 Communication services	563	1,000	1,000
05 Rents and utility services	2,780	3,000	3,000
06 Printing and reproduction	193	1,000	1,000
07 Other contractual services	373,176	1,967,936	2,288,000
08 Supplies and materials	943	1,000	1,000
09 Equipment	10		
10 Lands and structures	22,793,641	46,132,065	28,334,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	3,809,268	3,702,000	3,652,000
13 Refunds, awards, and indemnities	68,306	63,000	63,000
15 Taxes and assessments	37,941	39,000	41,000
Total allocation accounts	90,736,901	113,056,001	94,887,200
Total obligations	1,079,492,349	903,000,000	885,000,000
Obligations are distributed as follows:			
Department of the Air Force	988,755,448	789,943,999	790,112,800
Department of the Army	67,714,342	65,091,000	64,887,200
Department of the Navy	19,099,517	25,016,936	15,000,000
Department of Commerce	3,923,042	22,948,065	15,000,000

General Statement of the Under Secretary of the Air Force

Mr. Sheppard. Will you make your statement, Mr. Secretary? We will not interrupt you until you have finished.

Mr. Charyk. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

It is a pleasure for me to appear before you to initiate the presentation of the Department of the Air Force military construction appropriations program for fiscal year 1961. The period in which we are is a most challenging one. The Air Force is striving to obtain early operational capability of a large missile force. At the same time the projected essential manned force must be supported. We must and are constantly reviewing our goals as projected through the next several critical years. Manifestly, changes must be made and we must face up to them. I assure you that we are acting in response to our best judgment and what we feel is in the best national interest.

The program before you takes into consideration the recently approved missile and air defense revisions. My comments will, therefore, be directed to the program as we know it at this time.

The projects included in the Air Force fiscal year 1961 "Military construction" appropriation programs have been subjected to several detailed reviews within the Air Force. They have received the approval of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The program includes urgently needed facilities to support the operational forces and to accommodate the related personnel. The military construction proposed was coordinated with the other appropriations which have been presented to the Committee on Appropriations.

Fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation programs

For fiscal year 1961 the Air Force military construction program embraces four appropriations. The total new obligating authority requested under the President's budget is $740 million. The appropriations and the amounts of new obligating authority for each are:

	Million
Military construction, Air Force	$725
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	4
Military construction, Air National Guard	7
Military construction, Air Force (special foreign currency program)	4

Order of presentation

The Air Force will provide a complete justification of its construction programs and the individual construction projects therein. We will try to do this consistent with clarity and brevity. The witnesses are prepared to describe the programs and projects in detail, their purposes, the weapon systems of which they form a part, and the basis of the estimated costs included.

We understand that the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard military construction programs will be presented following completion of discussions of the regular Air Force military construction program.

SPECIAL JUSTIFICATION

Within the military construction program for the Regular Forces there are a number of construction projects which are repeated at different locations. To acquaint the members of this committee with the special need for these items, and to possibly conserve the time of the committee during the review of individual bases, we would propose to make a special presentation of these repetitive items including a detailed description of their construction.

It is our purpose to provide full and accurate information for your consideration of the Air Force programs.

SIGNIFICANT FACTORS IN AIR FORCE PROGRAMING

In Secretary Sharp's earlier appearances before other committees, he stressed two significant factors affecting the Air Force—change and cost. Both of these factors have a significant bearing on our base program.

As to change, the rapid evolution of air power—and the accelerating transition into aerospace power—has created requirements for new facilities. For some of our programs, base facilities now are a critical element, since they are an integral part of the basic weapon system. This is evident in the case of missiles and space-vehicles and for the facilities housing the computers, displays, and control functions which are a principal element of many of the new systems.

The flexibility and judgment inherent in the manned airplane, which are not characteristic of missiles, will require that we continue to operate manned systems during the foreseeable future. As I mentioned above, to make these manned systems effective, we must continue their modernization. This modernization, in turn, requires construction.

The factor of change which is dictating the need for special types of base facilities for new equipment, likewise involves the numbers and quality of the people we need. To maintain, operate, and control modern weapons we need highly trained, experienced personnel. Numerous personnel programs and actions taken in recent years, in large measure made possible by the legislative support of the Congress, have resulted in increased personnel retention. A high retention level of trained personnel is essential to the building of a professional force. Here again, however, base facilities play an important part in the attainment of our personnel program goals. The higher quality and maturity of the force result in larger families for whom adequate facilities must be provided to continue a desirable retention level of skilled personnel.

The factor of cost has had a major influence on Air Force actions and objectives in both base utilization and base construction programing areas. As the costs of hardware for new or improved systems constantly increase, so do the complexity and cost of the base facilities in which we house the hardware. Therefore, we make the most efficient and economical use of existing base facilities for the normal support functions. We must request new construction only where existing facilities are inadequate or nonexistent, or where the facility required is peculiar to the weapon systems.

Directly related to those considerations are the associated and substantial costs of base operation and maintenance. Our efforts to effect economies in base utilization have been applied in many areas such as reduction of construction standards where consistent with good engineering practice and the planned period of utilization; increased adaptation of existing base facilities to meet new requirements when feasible; and modernization of such facilities as dormitories and utility plants.

With respect to base closures, the Air Force is fully aware of the significance and impact of such actions upon the local community. However, as the force structure decreases and the transition into a growing capability in missiles and space applications progresses, closing of some of the presently operating installations must follow. This is inevitable to achieve the vital economies of both personnel and operating costs.

In recent months, announcements have been made of some planned closure or major activity reduction of a number of Air Force bases. For example, the following base closures have been announced: For fiscal year 1960, R. I. Bong and Malden; for fiscal year 1961, Burlington/Ethan Allen. As further evolution of our forces occurs, additional base reductions will be necessary. I am confident that the Congress will support us where such actions are indicated and are fully justified.

The fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation program for the active forces will be financed by two appropriations: "Military construction, Air Force," and a new appropriation of which Mr. Lincoln spoke in his statement, entitled, "Military construction, Air Force (special foreign currency program)." For the convenience of the committee in its review of our program the listing of projects for each location is a combined listing which includes all of the line items proposed for financing under these two appropriations.

FISCAL YEAR 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION PROGRAM

The Air Force requests new obligating authority for construction under the President's budget for the active forces in the amount of $729 million, which, with resources to be gained through reimbursements of $5 million, will provide total new fund availability in fiscal year 1961 of $734 million. The line items of construction in the Air Force program fall within the following significant mission areas:

	Million
Strategic	$385
Defense	98
Other operational support	251
Total	734

STRATEGIC FORCES

The provision of operating facilities for the strategic forces is still the Air Force's most pressing responsibility.

The basic objective of the Air Force today is to maintain in being aerospace forces of sufficient size, quality, and effectiveness as to deter any potential enemy from initiating war, or failing that, to defeat decisively any aggression which might be launched against the

United States and its allies. Within the Air Force structure, the central element of this deterrent power is the Stratigic Air Command. In support of this very vital deterrent role of SAC, we request $385 million. This is 52 percent of the total fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation program.

To provide facilities for the TITAN, ATLAS, and MINUTEMAN intercontinental ballistic missiles programs and the SAMOS and MIDAS reconnaissance satellite systems, $298 million is included.

The major portion of these funds will be applied to the TITAN missile, including facilities for four additional operational squadrons, technical support, and test facilities, an increment of training facilities for both TITAN and ATLAS, and for some provision for advance preparation of additional operational sites to be programed in future years.

Funding approved by the Congress in prior years' programs will provide for construction of hardened operational sites for the first six TITAN missile squadrons. The first two sites are well along under construction under approval granted in fiscal year 1959. Contracts for four additional sites, in our fiscal year 1960 program, were awarded during the past 5 months, and the construction of these sites has been initiated. These prior actions, together with the funds requested in the fiscal year 1961 program, will provide facilities for 10 of the currently planned 14 squadrons of TITAN.

The fiscal year 1961 program contains only a small amount for the ATLAS ICBM. Together with amounts approved in prior years, this construction will substantially complete the currently approved ATLAS program. Funds appropriated in previous years will provide the essential operational facilities to accommodate 13 operational squadrons of ATLAS missiles. The Vandenberg AFB site is now operational; two other sites, provided by the fiscal year 1958 program, are virtually completed; and three additional sites, included in our 1958 and 1959 programs, are currently under construction. Contracts for construction for the seventh and eighth squadrons have recently been awarded, and the ninth squadron is planned to be placed under contract this month.

Some fiscal year 1960 funds have recently been reprogramed with your committee's approval to increase the operational ATLAS squadrons from 9 to 13 squadrons. The Air Force is now proceeding with the design of sites for the four added squadrons, and construction contracts are expected to be awarded this summer. As you know, the President has recently approved the revised Air Force program to provide additional ATLAS missiles and launchers for the last six approved squadrons. Based upon a recent favorable bid and in the expectation that bids for the remainder of the sites are not out of line with this experience, it is now the Air Force estimate that the increased configuration can be accomplished within the fund availability approved by your committee. Your approval of this increased scope is requested. It is our intention to proceed with the necessary work leading to contract for the revised configuration.

The fiscal year 1961 program will provide short-leadtime technical support facilities for the 11th, 12th, and 13th squadrons and substantially complete the program presently approved.

Facilities are included for the first operational squadrons for the MINUTEMAN solid propellant ICBM, for the operational develop-

ment of this advanced missile system, and for MINUTEMAN missile crew training. Provision is also made for site preparation for a follow-on operational squadron, for which construction funds will be programed in fiscal year 1962. The feasibility of providing mobile launching platforms for a portion of the future MINUTEMAN force is currently under consideration, but no fund requirements for this concept are included in this appropriation request.

The facilities being constructed for all of the TITAN and MINUTEMAN locations will be in a dispersed and hardened configuration. The facilities under construction for the first four ATLAS squadrons were in a soft configuration, while those for the last 9 squadrons were in different degrees of hardening, with the last six ATLAS units equivalent in hardness to the TITAN construction. The vulnerability of these missiles will, therefore, be considerably reduced and their deterrent effectiveness significantly enhanced.

The timely construction of launch facilities is basic to the establishment of these weapon systems in being. The funding approvals requested today are directly related to the attainment of the scheduled operational dates for the missile squadrons.

A total of $17 million is requested for construction for the SAMOS and MIDAS satellite systems. The SAMOS is a reconnaissance satellite which will provide valuable strategic information as to the actions of potential enemies. The MIDAS is an early warning satellite containing infrared detection devices which can sense ballistic missiles just after launch—while still in the boost phase—and generate instantaneous alarm. The latter system, used in conjunction with the ballistic missiles early warning system, will provide earlier warning and therefore more time to react. This improvement in warning notices is an invaluable assist to the exercise of our retaliatory force, when the act of retaliation must be determined in less than 30 minutes.

Some $64 million is requested for facilities to support the strategic bomber and refueling forces. The major portion of these funds will accommodate the B–52 aircraft. We plan to convert March Air Force Base from a B–47 to a B–52 base. At Fairchild Air Force Base, we must replace runway and taxiway pavement which is failing under continuous heavy aircraft operations.

Of special importance for the direction of the Strategic Air Command are the proposed Combat Operations Centers requested at Barksdale Air Force Base, for $7 million, and March Air Force Base, for $8 million. We also plan to improve existing command facilities at Offutt Air Force Base. These facilities are required to insure the survival of SAC's ability to command the force, manually and electronically, as appropriate, with maximum security and reliability of communications. In the fiscal year 1962 program we would hope to provide for expansion of our COC at Westover Air Force Base and thus complete this vital command control system for SAC.

AIR DEFENSE

We now come to that portion of the program in which recent changes will have major impacts. On March 24, General White proposed certain changes in the Air Force program to accomplish three primary objectives.

1. More timely completion of an improved defense against the air breathing threat;

2. Acceleration of systems designed to provide ballistic missile warning, and

3. An improved deterrent posture.

The impacts on construction that we have been able so far to identify are primarily in the BOMARC and SUPER SAGE areas. As for the fiscal year 1961 line items which you have before you, we do not show any fund requirements for the BOMARC and SUPER SAGE Combat Centers since these were eliminated as a result of the Air Defense reorientation. The proposed construction for the Air Defense area totals $98 million. Our witnesses are prepared to discuss the details as we come to the appropriate program areas.

I might just comment that it would appear that there would be a savings of the order of approximately $60 million.

OTHER OPERATIONAL SUPPORT

Finally, $251 million, or 34 percent of the total program, is requested for construction to support our tactical forces, the Military Air Transport Service, and general support functions which do not specifically relate to any single mission area but which are indispensable to the effective performance of the overall Air Force mission.

For the Tactical Forces the Air Force requests $18 million. This amount includes $11 million for a second increment of hardened operational facilities for the MACE missile system and $7 million for operational, maintenance, training, and support facilities at various locations in the United States and overseas.

For the Military Air Transport Service $6 million is requested; $3.2 million of this amount is requested for the construction of a new building for the Aeronautical Chart and Information Center at St. Louis, Mo. The balance of the Military Air Transport Service program will provide operational, maintenance, and food storage facilities at six bases and a much needed photographic laboratory at Turner Air Force Base in support of the aerial mapping and charting mission.

The remaining items embraced by this category have general application to the total Air Force mission; $14 million is requested for facilities in support of Air Materiel Command depot operations; $32 million is requested for training and educational support facilities which includes the School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base. Additional research and development facilities for the Air Research and Development Command bases will require $29 million. Three million dollars is requested for facilities to accommodate the transfer of the Combat Readiness Training and Special Air Mission activities from Bolling Air Force Base and Washington National Airport to Andrews Air Force Base. This action will, together with programs approved in prior years, provide the minimum facilities required to effect the move. Also included are facilities, in the amount of $10 million to support the worldwide activities of the Air Force Security Service; $26 million of construction for the Pacific Air Force; $22 million for U.S. Air Forces in Europe; and construction in the amount of $5 million for activities of the Air Force Technical Applications Center.

The balance of this category provides $84 million for the necessary annual increments of planning, minor construction; off-base access roads, acquisition of minor land interests; support of the title VIII

family housing program; and long term lease of land in Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands.

TOPICS FOR SPECIAL COMMENT

Mr. Chairman, this completes my discussion of the specific program categories and the related dollar amounts in the fiscal year 1961 military construction program for the Regular Forces. In the remaining portion of my statement I would like to discuss several aspects of our construction program which are of unusual significance in the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 time periods.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

First, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that the funds available for construction which remain unobligated at the end of the present fiscal year are still required for projects already approved by this committee. During December 1959, it was estimated that approximately $511 million would remain unobligated at the end of the fiscal year 1960. In the meantime and in keeping with our effort to screen all requirements thoroughly before obligations are incurred, the Air Force has been rescreening all projects within the past 3 months as to their validity. In addition, revisions in the Air Defense program have come within this time period. As a result, there has been a slowing down of the obligation rate originally estimated for this time period. It is now estimated that an unobligated balance of approximately $592 million will remain at the end of the fiscal year 1960. These unobligated funds are designated for projects approved by this committee a year ago and for items in the fiscal year 1961 authorization request proposed for funding out of presently available funds. The balance of projects in the fiscal year 1960 program constitute a group of sound, valid construction requirements since they represent the projects of higher priority remaining after the screening which was conducted incident to the reprograming for ATLAS squadrons.

BASE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

As I have portrayed in my summaries of the appropriation request, the Air Force has devoted the major portion of its fiscal year 1961 construction program to the provision of facilities required for new weapons systems and specialized operational types of facilities directly related to improved equipment.

The construction program which we are presenting today contains limited amounts for the improvement or replacement of inadequate and substandard facilities or the provision of additional facilities for increased morale and improved living standards for our military personnel and their families. Significant progress has been made along these lines in recent years, but much remains to be accomplished to attain appropriate and practical standards. However, in the face of continuing requirements for costly operational facilities in direct support of the new weapons systems being brought into our inventory, we recognize that the program to improve our existing physical plant must be executed on a phased basis over a period of years.

REPLACEMENT OF INADEQUATE FACILITIES

In this program we are requesting $43 million for projects devoted wholly or partially to the replacement of inadequate, substandard facilities. Thirteen million dollars of these items are exclusively replacements and $30 million will provide replacements for inadequate facilities which are also deficient in size.

MEDICAL AND PERSONNEL FACILITIES

An increment of facilities has been included in the program to alleviate the inadequacies and deficiencies of our existing medical and personnel facilities. Facilities in this category comprise a total of approximately $80 million in our program.

Medical items total $21.6 million. Included in this amount is $8 million for construction at the School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., which was previously mentioned. About $11 million will replace four hospitals within the United States. The balance of the program of medical facilities consists of a relatively minor amount of $2 million to provide dental clinics at three locations, a facility for the inspection of food at Travis Air Force Base, Calif., and five dispensary projects.

Personnel and community facilities requested for our military personnel and their families total $58 million. Some $20 million of this amount will provide 1,363 units of family housing at 7 oversea locations, 27 units of family housing at one location within the continental United States, and rehabilitation of substandard housing at an isolated aircraft control and warning site in the United States. Funds in the amount of $2 million are requested for support of the title VIII (Capehart) housing program.

About $20 million is requested for dormitories, officers' quarters, dining facilities and chapel facilities at various locations in the United States and overseas.

The balance of this portion of our program—$18 million—will provide 12 dependent schools in oversea areas, 7 of which are additions to existing schools, airmen's service clubs, open messes, and other morale and recreational facilities.

CONCLUSION

This concludes my remarks on the appropriation program, Mr. Chairman. However, I would like to present at this time a list of projects totaling $39,789,000 which have received the approval of the Office, Secretary of Defense, and the Bureau of the Budget for reprograming against available fiscal year 1960 and prior year funds. Authorization approval for these projects is being requested of the respective Armed Services Committees. A summary of the items has been made available to your committee and we are prepared to discuss the projects contained in this reprograming for the purpose of receiving your approval of our proposed reprograming.

REVISION IN AIR FORCE FISCAL YEAR 1961 BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will insert at this point in the record correspondence received from the Secretary of Defense relative to certain changes in the Air Force program.

(The letters follow:)

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 12, 1960.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Apropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Subsequent to the Air Force presentation on March 24, 1960, by General White, Chief of Staff, USAF, before the House Department of Defense Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, and based on further review of the Air Force estimates for construction, the Air Force desires to change the construction estimates presented to the Appropriations Subcommittee as a part of the overall adjustments to the air defense and ballistic missile programs.

Certain lump sum bids received for the construction of ATLAS facilities indicate that the 1 by 12 configurations for the six ATLAS squadrons can be constructed within available funds provided by the Congress for the 1 by 9 configurations. The $90 million estimate, therefore, presented by the Air Force as required for the ATLAS construction, is no longer required for that program.

The construction programs for the Air Force and the Air National Guard are presently being revised by the Department of the Air Force to show the reconciliation of available funds, the new obligational authority required for 1961, and the program which is to be funded with these dollars. As soon as these adjustments are completed, your subcommittee will be informed accordingly.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. GATES.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 13, 1960.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to my letter of April 12, 1960, in which I stated that certain changes in the Department of the Air Force military construction program would be transmitted to your subcommittee upon completion of their review in the Department of Defense.

This review has been completed now and the details concerning the line items and funds involved are shown in tables I and II, attached.

The details and justifications for these line items will be presented by the Department of the Air Force when they appear before your subcommittee in support of the fiscal year 1961 "Military construction, Air Force" appropriation request.

The approval by your subcommittee of the revisions set forth in tables I and II is recommended.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. GATES.

TABLE I.—*Reductions in fiscal year 1961 and prior years Air Force military construction*

[In thousands]

	1959 and prior	1960	1961
Bomarc	$12,000		
SAGE—Super	17,500	$54,300	$23,100
Hanscom	4,200		
Support (Dobbins)			1,000
Clinton County Air Force Base		3,500	3,600
Norad Headquarters		[1] 8,500	
Bomarc cancellations	[1] 2,500		
Total, by year	36,200	66,300	27,700
Total deductions		$130,200	

[1] Estimates based on Air Force testimony before House Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on March 24, 1960.

TABLE II.—*Approved addendum to fiscal year 1961 Air Force military construction program*

Project	*Thousand*
Manual control centers	$7,500
Convert DC's to CC's	2,700
Support facilities, 32d Air Division	2,000
Increased GATR's	2,000
Family housing, Japan	7,763
Cannon—R/W replacement	1,021
Moody—Various facilities (fiying training)	1,389
Hill—Missile maintenance	2,900
Maxwell—Officers' quarters	431
O/S family housing and commissary facilities	5,900
Ballistic missiles	21,000
Shell housing modification	1,621
Various items in authorization bill	7,330
Total	63,555

STATUS OF FISCAL YEAR 1961 PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any items in this program which have not been fully approved by reviewing agencies? If you do, what are they?

Mr. CHARYK. I do not believe we have any such items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any items which will not be placed under contract in fiscal year 1961?

General MINTON. There will be some.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many, approximately?

General MINTON. I would say, based on our past experience, approximately $100 million worth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you anticipate that any of these items will not be fully funded in fiscal year 1961?

General MINTON. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking, to what extent is the program based on completed plans and specifications? I would like a complete answer on that, please, gentlemen.

General MINTON. I believe Colonel Edmonds has more detailed information on that than I. I will ask him to answer it.

Colonel EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, about 85 percent of this program has been planned through the preliminary stages. A substantial additional amount is planned, you might say, to the 100 percent stage.

We have purposely this year, in order to eliminate wastage of planning money, waited a little later than usual to issue our instructions to go to final plans. For that reason a substantial portion of the program is just through the preliminary stage. The preliminary stage may be 60 to 70 percent of what the final stage would be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you contemplate issuing any contracts under the premise that your plans are not formalized, and if so, what will be the percentage?

General MINTON. No, sir; we will not. We will not issue any invitation for bids without complete plans and specifications.

Let me add, unless for some project which I cannot now foresee, in which case we will come to this committee and ask your approval.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you will formulate the same program you have had heretofore.

General MINTON. Yes; 100 percent.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And that includes those that are not actually formalized.

General MINTON. That is correct.

REAL PROPERTY DISPOSALS OR INACTIVATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would insert in the record the real property disposal or inactivation action taken or contemplated by the Air Force in fiscal year 1960 and 1961.

I want you to discuss, off the record if necessary, any that you have under consideration but not announced for fiscal year 1961 or fiscal year 1962.

Do you have any in that category?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. CHARYK. We will have to bring together the various pieces of information and, as I say, on a category basis this does present a problem. In cases where final decisions have been made, these of course are made available to the committee immediately. I would be happy to review for you the various areas where we have problems and where decisions have to be made. At the present time we are not in position definitely to state that these are specifically bases on which action is proposed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you not think the question might be directed to those who have final decision and you might include in the record, those that they have contemplated which perhaps at the moment you do not happen to know about?

Mr. CHARYK. We shall certainly be happy to put together as definitive a list as possible at the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is all we can expect of you.

(The information requested follows:)

As a matter of clarification, the attached lists are based on dates of anticipated disposals by the disposal agency and deletion from inventory. Fiscal year 1960 is divided into those actions completed and those forecast for disposal during the remainder of the fiscal year. Fiscal year 1961 actions are all forecast.

FISCAL YEAR 1960 DISPOSALS COMPLETED

State and base	Acres	Cost
Alabama: Craig radio range annex	14.46	$4,000
Arizona: Vincent Air Force Base	347.00	3,988
California:		
Parks AFB (and off bases)	3,912.34	
Beale AFB	54,036.00	2,269,512
Florida: Boca Raton auxiliary field	752.00	1
Kentucky: Owingsville AFB	11.90	18,000
Massachusetts:		
Cambridge Electrical Research Annex	.50	200,000
Monks Hill radio relay annex	(1)	200
Michigan: Wurtsmith AFB	9,800.00	2,098
Minnesota: Rochester AFS	22.90	9,000
Mississippi: Greenville ILS outer marker	14.00	350
New York:		
Manhattan Beach AFS	4.74	
Jervis test annex	908.00	4,410
Hancock Field	50.00	
South Carolina:		
Otlanta radio relay annex	1.00	1
Oakley radio relay annex	(1)	
Tennessee: Alcoa ammo storage annex	452.00	10,600
Texas: Hondo recreational annex	(1)	1
Virginia: Langley middle marker annex No. 2	(1)	250

[1] Less than 1 acre.

B. DISPOSALS FORECAST

State and base	Acres	Cost
Iowa: Dallas Center AFS	38	$76,500
Louisiana: Barksdale AFB	28	221,000
Tennessee: Arnold Engineering Development Center	959	86,500
Texas:		
Hondo Hsg Annex	20	543,953
Vancourt AF auxiliary field	976	185,649
Vermont: Burlington MAP	197	4,949,212
Washington: George Wright AFS	966	3,110,238

FISCAL YEAR 1961 DISPOSALS FORECAST

California:		
Cheli AFS	395	$10,108,396
Long Beach MAP	155	2,880,000
Florida:		
Buckingham AFB	769	153,345
Miami IAP	100	297,000
Palm Beach AFB	2,163	23,000,000
Iowa: Sioux City MAP	829	3,176,000
Louisiana: Baton Rouge AFS	531	2,049,000
Michigan:		
Willow Run Airport	24	225,000
Willow Run AFS	134	175,000
New Mexico: Tierra Amarilla	107	53,888
New York:		
Niagara Falls MAP	528	16,671,000
Wallkill transmitter annex	628	57,001
Oklahoma: Vance radio range annex	8	12,389
Texas: Goodfellow AFB	3	1,142
Vermont: Ethan Allen AFB	1,203	4,756,876
Wisconsin:		
R. Bong AFB	5,537	28,300,000
Truax Field Bomarc site	101	35,000

The Air Force has announced the planned closure of R. I. Bong Air Force Base, Wis.; Malden Air Base, Mo.; and Burlington/Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Vt.

For record purposes, a separate statement will be supplied the committee.

CONTRACT AWARDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What contracts were awarded in fiscal year 1960 on other than an advertised competitive bid basis, and why?

Colonel EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, I have a list of all the contracts which have been awarded by the Air Force or by the Army for the Air Force on other than a competitive bid basis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have the reasons attached to those that are not on competitive bid basis? Do you have that basic information?

Colonel EDMONDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may insert that in the record in response to the question, please.

(The list referred to follows:)

Department of the Air Force

Report required by sec. 405 of Public Law 86–149 covering military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising during the 6-month period from July 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959

Name of company with which contract was placed	Location of work (name of base and State or country in which located)	Description of military construction provided by contract	Public law which authorized this military construction	Dollar amount of contract	Reason why contract was awarded without formal advertisement
Mabuchi Kensetsu Co	Yokota Airbase, APO 328, Fussa-Machi, Nishitamagun, Tokyo, Japan.	Construction of ILS facility at Yokota Airbase, contract AF62 (511)–706.	Public Law 685	$82,000.00	Negotiated procurement as contemplated by 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6).
Coastal Equipment Co., Lemon and Lewis Sts., Tarpon Springs, Fla.	Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., at EGTR site D–4, Anclote, Pasco County, Fla.	Drilling and/or driving approximately 4 shallow water wells.	Public Law 85–241	960.00	Negotiated procurement as contemplated by 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(3).
Farmers Electric Cooperative, Inc., Box 510, Clovis, N. Mex.	Santa Rosa, Guadalupe County, N. Mex.	Installation of new facilities (electrical) to serve gap filler M–90B site.	Public Law 968	13,899.00	Negotiated procurement as contemplated by 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(10).
Impresa Re Ulisse, Via Mazzini, 12 Godroipo, Italy.	Aviano, Italy	Construction of cold storage building.	Public Law 85–865, title III, sec. 303.	33,896.94	Negotiated procurement as contemplated by 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(6).
Luigi Salvi Via Penzi, 12 Pordenone, Italy.	do	Masonry addition to headquarters building.	do	6,231.88	Do.
Impresa Pogorelz & Figlio ViaNarvesa, 4 Pordenone, Italy.	do	Construction of new POL station	do	39,859.90	Do.
Lama Romano, San Martino di Campagna, Italy.	do	Construction of transformer cabin and platform for humidity measuring set.	do	2,653.93	Do.
Sante Del Col, Via Marsure, 15 Pordenone, Italy.	do	Construction of 2 platforms and metal stands.	do	954.59	Do.
Geom Luigi, Salvi, Via Penzi, 12 Aviano, Italy.	do	Construction of masonry addition to headquarters building.	do	7,826.09	Do.
Imp. Rodolfo de Franceschi, Via B. Odorico, Pordenone, Italy.	do	Installation of 2 antenna masts	do	2,045.09	Do.
Pagano, Anselmo, Via Marconi, 54 Pordenone, Italy.	Grosseto, Italy	Construction of 4 each aircraft shelters, 1 each readiness crew building, and 1 each readiness crew messhall.	Sec. 303(a), title III, Public Law 86–149.	101,475.16	Do.
Impressa Pagano, Anselmo, Viale Marconi, 54 Pordenone, Italy.	Aviano, Italy	Construction of 3 each masonry storage buildings.	do	14,427.19	Do.
Geom Luigi Salvi, Via Penzi, 12 Aviano, Italy.	do	Construction of readiness messhall, readiness crew building and 4 each aircraft shelters.	do	96,500.99	Do.
AlbertoPezzutti, Fontanafredda, Italy	do	Installation of security area lighting and fencing.	do	2,387.13	Do.
Moretton Emilio & Figlio, Via Friuli, 21 Pordenone, Italy.	do	Construction of 2 platforms for installation of a ceilometer.	do	187.60	Do.
Metcalf Hamilton & Grove	Incirlik Airbase, Adana, Turkey.	Installation of family housing trailers.	do	100,000.00	Do.

Soiel Boneh, Ltd	do	Construct Victor alert profects	do	74,805.00	Do.

Turkey.	trailers.				
Solel Boneh, Ltd	do	Construct Victor alert projects	do	74,805.00	Do.
Do	Izmir, Turkey	Erect aircraft shelter and crew building.	do	140,176.00	Do.
Do	do	Security lighting of fence and mess hall.	do	98,489.00	Do.
Do	Incirlik Air Base, Adana, Turkey.	Exterior electrical work	Public Law 85-685	10,681.00	Do.
Josef Kuelzer & Sohn, Simmern/Hunsrueck, Germany.	Hahn Air Base, Germany	Erection of 1 U.S. Government furnished MB-1 type building to serve as engine shop.	Sec. 303(a), title III, Public Law 86-149.	24,200.00	Do.
Hummel & Baumann, Kaiserslautern, Germany, Vogelwoogstrasse.	Ramstein Air Base, Germany.	Erection of 3 prefabricated buildings.	do	74,999.15	Do.
Wilhelm Faber, Strassehbau Schlierschied/Hunsrueck, Germany.	Hahn Airbase, Germany	Construction of an access road, a parking area, and installation of utility lines.	do	13,692.25	Do.
Fr. Wilhelm Stichtmann K. G., 23 Am Zoll-u.-Binnenhafen, Mainz, Germany.	do	Construction of concrete trim pad and concrete access road.	do	66,600.46	Do.
Josef Kuelzer & Sohn, Simmern/Hunsrueck, Germany.	do	Erection of 3 prefabricated buildings.	do	57,607.99	Do.
Ferdinand Tausendpfund	Wiesbaden, Germany	Supplementary agreement No. 1 to contract AF61(546)-577 for modification of aircraft wash wastes treatment plant.	do	1,597.51	Do.
Leomhard Moll G.m.b.H. 4½ Am Exerzierplatz, Wuerzburg, Germany.	Spangdahlem Airbase	Erection of 6 aircraft shelters and construction of a security fence.	do	141,489.40	Do.
Horsch & Sohn, 45 Ostallee, Trier, Germany.	do	Delivery and erection of 1 alert dormitory.	do	16,898.80	Do.
Scontino Francesco (contract AF63(192)-1077.	Wheelus Airbase, Libya	Construction of supply and equipment warehouse.	do	6,063.00	Do.
Kennedy Electric Co., Inc., 132 Bay Bridge Rd., Prichard, Ala.	Brookley Air Force Base, Ala.	Modification of electric switching station No. 2 and distribution system project MO-49A-9.	Public Law 685	62,600.00	Small business restricted advertising.

[1] Connection charge, $5 (membership fee).

Air Force projects awarded by Army without formal advertising

Name of company with which contract was placed	Location of work (name of base and State or country in which located	Description of military construction provided by contract	Public law which authorized this military construction	Dollar amount of contract	Reason why contract was awarded without formal advertisement
Notomi-Kensetsu Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 2, Naha Central Post Office, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, in joint venture with Uraga Dock Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 8, Ginowan, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands.	Kadena Airbase, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands.	Construction of taxiway shoulder stabilization and utilities thereto at Kadena Airbase.	Public Law 85-241	$9,564.15	Work performed outside the United States, its territories, and possessions.
James E. Bandy & Associates, Ltd., Route No. 1, Post Office Box 178, Naha, Machinato, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands.	Naha Airbase, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands.	Construction of AUW shop and exterior utilities thereto at Naha Airbase.	Public Law 83-534	8,173.73	Do.
C. E. Harris Builders, Inc., Post Office Box 334, Naha, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands.	do	Construction of NAF ammunition storage facility at Naha Airbase on Okinawa, Ryukyu Island.	Public Law 85-685	54,400.00	Work performed outside the United States, its territories, and possessions. Competitive proposals solicited.
Keang Nam Enterprises, Ltd., No. 151, 2-Ka, In Hyun-Dong, Chung-Ku, Seoul, Korea.	K-14, Kimpo, Korea	Special operation facilities guidance station No. 4.	do	54,000.00	Do.
Han Yang Construction Co., Ltd., Room No. 622, No. 100, Juh-Dong, Chung-Ku, Seoul, Korea.	K-53, Paik Myung-Do, Korea.	Special operation facilities guidance station No. 5.	do	48,000.00	Do.
Sang Ho Civil & Architectural Co., Ltd., No. 138, 3-Ka, Chungwang-Ro, Kunsan, Cholla Pukdo, Korea.	Kunsan, Korea	Construction of base control tower, K-8.	do	48,851.40	Do.
Shin Kwang Electric Industrial Co., Ltd., No. 51, 2-Ka, Ulchi-Ro, Chung-Ku, Seoul, Korea.	Osan, Korea	Telephone and communication facilities.	Public Law 86-149	98,902.91	Do.
Kun Sul Industrial Co., Ltd., No. 7, 1-Ka, Myung-Dong, Chung-Ku, Seoul, Korea.	K-55, Osan, Korea	Special operation facilities guidance station No. 1.	Public Law 85-685	59,500.00	Do.
Southeast Asia Enterprise Co., No. 31, Pukchang-Dong Chung-Ku, Seoul, Korea.	K-10, Seoul, Korea	Special operation facilities guidance station No. 3.	do	36,288.30	Do.
Riedesel Lowe Co., Post Office Box 914, Cheyenne, Wyo.	Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo.	Construction of wave guidance enclosure.	Public Law 85-241	280,000.00	Impracticable to secure competition by formal advertisement because of need to meet beneficial occupancy date set by the using service. Competitive proposals solicited.

The Ralph M. Parsons Co., 617 West 7th St., Los Angeles, Calif.	Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.	Construction of TITAN	Public Law 85-685	2,186,500.00	Impractical to secure competition by formal advertising because of the need to meet the beneficial occupancy date set by Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.
			Public Law 86-149	500,000.00	Do.
Bechtel Corp., 4620 Seville Ave., Vernon, Calif.	do	Construction of ATLAS silo launch test facility.	Public Law 85-325	3,200.00	Impracticable to secure competition by formal advertisement because of urgent need to repair cracks to prevent damages to aircrafts and injury to personnel. Competitive proposals solicited.
Federal Joint Sealing Co., East 3527 Nora, Spokane, Wash.	Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.	Runway pavement repair			
Orlando Welding & Piping Contractors, 1348 West Central Ave., Orlando, Fla.	Air Force Missile Test Center, Patrick Air Force Base.	Construction of G/M liquid fuel facilities.	Public Law 85-685	141,245.00	Impracticable to secure competition by formal advertisement because of urgent necessity to meet beneficial occupancy date set by the using service. Competitive proposals solicited.
			do	806,852.00	Do.
Diversified Builders, Inc., Post Office Box 1346, Cocoa, Fla.	do	Construction of blockhouse for space systems launch facility.	do	5,317,195.00	Do.
George A. Fuller Co., 1 Peachtree Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	do	Construction of MINUTEMAN facilities (WS-133A), complexes 31 and 32.	Public Law 84-968	28,515.00	Do.
R. E. Clarson, Inc., 1930 13th Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Fla.	do	To provide for erosion control for complexes 15, 16, 19, and 20.	do	3,128.00	Do.
Diversified Builders, Inc., Post Office Box 867, Cocoa, Fla.	do	To modify skimming basin and flume of complex 20.	Public Law 85-241	2,400.00	Negotiated pursuant to Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-203, purchase of less than $2,500. Competitive proposals solicited.
Stackhouse, Inc., Post Office Box 1289, Goldsboro, N.C.	Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N.C.	Installation of batter files to existing approach light structure in Neuse River.		563.00	Negotiated pursuant to Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-203, purchase of less than $32,500.
Dobbs Co., Box 146, Myrtle Beach, S.C.	Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, S.C.	Asphaltic concrete paving, ammunition storage shop.	do	289.00	Negotiated pursuant to Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-203, purchase of less than $2,500. Competitive proposals solicited.
Thompson Construction Co., Box 413, Charleston, S.C.	do	Brick walls under exterior steel stairway landings, EM dorms.	do	600.00	Do.
			Public Law 84-161	492.00	Do.
Electrical Contractors Co., Box 266, Mount Pleasant, S.C.	do	Electrical connections for hospital isolating transformer.	Public Law 85-685		
Todd Landscaping, Myrtle Beach, S.C.	do	Drainage ditch, officers quarters			

Air Force projects awarded by Army without formal advertising—Continued

Name of company with which contract was placed	Location of work (name of base and State or country in which located)	Description of military construction provided by contract	Public law which authorized this military construction	Dollar amount of contract	Reason why contract was awarded without formal advertisement
Cestone-Palladino Construction Co., 66 Oak Ridge Rd., Verona, N.J.	McGuire Airforce Base, Wrightstown, N.J.	Construction of 2 sun shields for helium receiver tanks.	Public Law 85-241	$4,000.00	Impracticable to secure competition by formal advertisement because of urgency to permit operation of the system without a hazardous conditon prevailing.
George H. Duross, Inc., 1617 Pennsylvania Blvd., Philadelphia, Pa.	do	Repairs to roof flashing of 56 model II shelters.	do	8,800.00	Impracticable to secure competition by formal advertisement due to emergency repairs necessary to prevent costly damage to complex operating equipment. Competitive proposals solicited.
Turkish Directorate of Highways, "Karayollari."	Trabzon and Samsun, Turkey.	Access roads	Public Law 83-534	67,000.00	Work performed outside the United States, its territories and possessions.
Solel Boneh, Ltd., Jahne St., Solel Boneh Bldg., Post Office Box 4854, Haifa, Israel.	Site 10, Turkey	2 aircraft servicing docks	Public Law 84-968	309,444.00	Do.
Oman-Farnsworth-Wright, Post Office Box 4974 Karachi, Pakistan.,	Peshawar, Pakistan	Communication facilities	Public Law 85-685	1,068,808.00	Do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you contemplate any further action in this respect in fiscal year 1960 or fiscal year 1961 beyond those that you are presenting for the record?

General MINTON. There is none that we know of now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your answer is none.

Insert in the record a statement showing any contracts not awarded to the low bidder, and show the reasons therefor.

(The information requested follows:)

Air Force contracts awarded to other than the low bidder July 1, 1959, to Mar. 31, 1960, continental United States

Location	Project	Estimated cost based on accepted bid	Date of award	Remarks
Columbus Air Force Station	Dining hall	$19,073	July 1959	Low bidder determined to be not responsible pursuant ASPR regulation 1-902 and 1-903.
Vandenberg BOMARC	Storage tank and cathodic protection	52,900	August 1959	Low bidder stipulated schedule B would not be accepted without schedule A. It was advantageous to Government to award schedule B to 2d low bidder for $52,900 and award schedule A to low bidder.
Whiteman and Janesville aircraft control and warning.	Unmanned gap filler	199,286	May 1959	Low bidder claimed error which was allowed by contracting officer. Award made to 2d low bidder.
Stead	Officers quarters	822,180	August 1959	Low bid rejected because of failure to submit bid bond at time of bid opening.
Do	Electrical distribution	4,796	do	Low bidder claimed error which was allowed by contracting officer. Award made to 2d low bidder.
McCoy Air Force Base	Storage ammunition, phase II	45,100	Mar. 30, 1960	Do.
Davis Field	Installation of water mains	18,440	Mar. 16, 1960	Do.
Barksdale	Air field paving	1,095,677	September 1959	Low bidder did not submit bid bond. Awarded to 2d low bidder.
Sheppard	Erosion control	75,521	February 1960	Low bidder claimed error; allowed by contracting officer. Awarded 2d low bidder.
Wurtsmith	Clearing, grubbing, topsoil seeding	67,490	March 1960	Do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you any outstanding cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts at the moment? If so, what are they and how many?

General MINTON. We have two that I know of, but I would like to have the opportunity to research that and furnish it for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

(The information requested follows:)

There are two outstanding cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts covering Air Force construction at the present time. Both of these contracts were awarded and are being supervised by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. The two contracts are as follows:

(*a*) Bechtel & Co. for construction of ATLAS silo launch test facilities at Vandenberg AFB; cost, $2,962,262.

(*b*) Ralph M. Parsons Co. for construction of TITAN silo launch test facilities at Vandenberg AFB; cost, $2,186,500.

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER CONTRACTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. How do you handle the award of architect-engineer contracts? I want the stipulated premise upon which those contracts are awarded, the general basis, the format upon which those contracts are awarded. Do you have that immediately available, or would you like to insert that in the record?

General MINTON. I think it would be better if we could insert that in the record. I think I can answer that better in that way.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first question has to do with the handling of them, and the next one has to do with the selection of the architect and engineer. It is a short question, but it has to do with a total exposition of how the contracts are handled.

(The information requested follows:)

POLICY

It is the general policy of the construction agencies of the Air Force to procure by negotiated fixed price contracts the professional services of architects and engineers to assist in the development of Air Force construction programs.

SELECTION OF ARCHITECT ENGINEERS

The selection of architectural and engineering firms for the preparation of plans and specifications for public works or for other similar technical and professional services, such as master planning, engineering studies, and investigations, will not be based upon competitive bidding procedures but solely upon the professional qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the services required, subject to the following additional considerations, if applicable:

(*a*) Specialized experience of the firm in the field required.

(*b*) Capacity of the firm to accomplish the work within required time limitations.

(*c*) Past experience of the firm with respect to performance on defense contracts.

(*d*) Location of the firm in the general geographical area of the project so as to provide for consideration and selection of an appropriate number of qualified firms who have performed similar type work.

Review will be made by a selection board composed of technically qualified personnel, of the known qualifications of firms engaged in practice in the required fields subject to the above considerations, if applicable, with a minimum of three firms to be chosen for detailed review, including interview if desired, of their overall qualifications with respect to the proposed work. These firms will be rated in order of preference. Professional and technical qualifications being equal, preference in the selection will be given to architect-engineers maintaining fully staffed operating offices in the general area of the project. After selection, negotiations will be initiated with the firms of the highest priority selected. In the event a mutually satisfactory contract cannot be consummated, the negotiations will be terminated and that firm so notified. Negotiations will then be

initiated with the second priority firm of the original three or more chosen. This procedure will be followed until a firm has been found with whom satisfactory terms may be concluded.

NEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

Architect-engineer contracts will be negotiated on the basis of a well-defined statement of work descriptive of the facilities to be designed and the services to be furnished. Fees will be based on estimated costs to be incurred by the architect-engineer in accomplishing the work and services required, and will not be computed on the basis of a dollar volume of construction. Fees will include direct costs, overhead on direct labor, general and administrative overhead, and profit. These costs are subject to limiting provisions contained in the armed services procurement regulations, and in such laws as may be applicable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What steps do you take to see that the Government gets the job done at the most economical price?

General MINTON. We have our projects designed through our construction agency, the Corps of Engineers, by the most competent architect and engineering firms that they can choose for the purpose. I believe they go into quite a bit of detail as to the firm's background and experience in these lines of work. Then the invitation to bid are advertised and awarded to the lowest bidder, except for the very few exceptions in which case this committee's clearance is obtained, and we will insert that in the record in answer to your previous question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you set up the format or procedure there, or do you turn the jobs over to the Army Engineers and let them use their criteria of selection? What I am trying to do is to draw a line of demarcation between what you people want done in awarding contracts and what they might do.

General MINTON. Mr. Chairman, we work together on it. Of course, the Corps of Engineers is our construction agency, and it has the responsibility. We must give it the authority. They use our criteria unless they find something wrong with it, in which case they discuss it with us and perhaps we change it. In the inspection they follow their usual procedures. If we think in certain cases, when we need to change it a bit, we discuss it with them. We have had complete cooperation with them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Aside from the Army Engineers, who act as your agent in contract procedures of this character, what is the comparability between their procedure and that of contracts issued within the framework of Air Force authority exclusively?

General MINTON. In that case, the selection of the architect-engineer in the first place is made by a board consisting of representatives from the Ballistic Missile Division with Corps of Engineers representatives on this board. Then the design is prepared by the architect-engineer under the supervision of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division but with the assistance of the Corps of Engineers, who have a field office in the same building that our Ballistic Missile Division is housed in. Once those designs are firmed up and specifications completed, they are furnished to the engineer district, who advertise them and supervise the construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are the same criteria applied in all instances, as far as you know?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there presently in existence regulations as to the formula to pursue or is it left to the interpretation of each organiza-

tion, to wit, Air Force on the one side, Army Engineers on the other side? Are they clearly defined by regulations, or are they not?

General MINTON. Mr. Sheppard, they are clearly defined. What form that definition is whether it is regulations or bulletins or letters, I am not sure. I would like to get that and furnish it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking, insofar as the procedures are concerned, the criteria should be identical, one versus the other, so far as your office is concerned.

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If there is any deviation, that is due to misinterpretation of the formula and procedure; is that correct?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your experience with reference to design deficiencies in A. & E. work that you have been subjected to whereby excessive change orders have been required and various and sundry other interjections beyond the original interpretation of the procedure?

General MINTON. We have had some cases where we were not satisfied with the work which had been performed by the Architect-Engineers and the results of instruction we have received. There have been very few. I think in every case we have called it to the attention of the people responsible for it and have had good results. I think that our change orders on construction have decreased materially in the past few years, for various reasons. We intend to pursue a course which will tend to decrease those change orders.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand, General, you have been watching that aspect very closely. Is that correct?

General MINTON. Yes, sir, personally.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the effect of handling this work on an advertised competitive bid basis just as you do construction contracts?

General MINTON. This work you are referring to now, Mr. Chairman, is the usual ballistic missile construction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not necessarily. It applies across the board.

Mr. TURNER. Architect and engineer work.

General MINTON. Of course, if I understand you now, to advertise for A. & E. work is considered in the profession, as I am sure you know, not ethical. It is much like a doctor. He cannot advertise his work; neither can a lawyer. The ethics of the engineering profession prohibit them from advertising.

Mr. SHEPPARD. He cannot advertise his concept of procedure, but that does not preclude the Air Force from analyzing their requirements and delineating the operations within the confines of its own procedure. So there is somewhat a difference between the two when we come to the permissible aspect of it.

General MINTON. I get the point a little better now. We do do this: After we have selected and the Corps of Engineers have made their selection of qualified architects and engineers to do the work, we may have a list of five that are best qualified. Then we go to the No. 1 on the list and negotiate a price with him. If we do not feel we are getting a satisfactory price, we do not give him the job. We go to the No. 2 man and maybe to the No. 3, 4, and 5 men. We do not give it to the No. 1 man on the list unless he gives us what we consider to be an adequate price. We do not advertise among those five.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, let me put it my way, General: In this field of operational idiosyncrasies, if that word is apropos, if you have a repetition of bad A. & E., that is your fault, because you selected them.

General MINTON. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing when you have had one or two bad experiences with A. & E. people? Do you still keep them on the available list for competitive purposes or negotiation?

General MINTON. I do not know of any case where we have had an architect and engineer who repeated mistakes in plans and specifications that they furnished us. We have had cases where we have called it to their attention. We have had a couple of cases where we have investigated it and pointed out that unless their work improved they would no longer be considered. Of course, the actual way that you obtain the objective you are speaking of is when we get this list of five qualified bidders, this man just isn't on the list for architect-engineering work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right, but do you eliminate him based upon his qualifications at the moment or his qualifications based on past operations?

General MINTON. He is eliminated on both. We do not have what I might call a blacklist of architects and engineers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not think it is a blacklist literally. I do not think that word applies, General. If I am wrong, you correct me. In selecting people to do this job, they can be very closely analyzed based upon the change orders as against what you, the Air Force, wanted and transmitted to them and they in turn produced for you. The more change orders, the more hazard involved. Is that not right?

General MINTON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assume that "X" company or corporation has given you two bad jobs, how many times to you consider them thereafter in competitive status?

General MINTON. I do not know of any case where we have. I know of cases where architects and engineers no longer appear on the qualified list and they are not invited to bid.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From an analysis of our past experience, it is pretty clearly indicated that the major portion of our difficulties in expenditures has been through misinterpretations or inadequate A. & E. jobs. In other words, there must be two premises to this problem. One is, Does the Air Force know what it wants in the first place? Then it is translated to the A. & E., you being responsible in the first place to know what you want. Then if they pick it up and give you a bad A. & E. job on which you have to issue a lot of change orders, obviously, in my book, that is rather interesting as to whether you want any more to do with them. Maybe that is putting it rather badly, but that is the story.

When you come to a misapprehension of the transition from what you know you want to what they give back to you and the result you get by change orders, that is where you step in and say, "We don't want any more of this," whether it is "X" company, corporation, or what-not. That is the practice you follow?

General MINTON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the item?

DISPOSAL AND INACTIVATION OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the discussion about the disposal or inactivation of any Air Force facilities during fiscal year 1961 and 1962. It is my understanding that Legislative Liaison has contacted various Members of Congress about certain bases which the Air Force is considering closing. Is that correct?

Mr. CHARYK. That is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. This is not a secret list, is it?

Mr. CHARYK. No. As I indicated, Mr. Laird, we are prepared to discuss the problem areas and the bases that are under consideration. We are not able to firm up at this time in a good many cases the specific bases which will finally be selected for deactivation.

Mr. LAIRD. You have had a study group which has made a study of this problem. They have made certain recommendations to you.

Mr. CHARYK. This is normal procedure. In other words, we have a staff review of the recommendations of a group of officers who are selected to look at the problem——

Mr. LAIRD. Do we have a copy of their report?

Mr. CHARYK. Generally the report has been in the form of a briefing, analysis of the problem. Additional factors and information are requested, and this is then supplied and eventually decisions are reached.

Mr. LAIRD. Is there money in this bill for any one of the bases under consideration?

Mr. TURNER. No, not to the best of our knowledge as we know it today. Those items were eliminated before the construction program went out of the Air Force.

Mr. LAIRD. There is no chance, then, that we could run into a similar situation as we did in last year's budget with the Bong Air Force Base?

Mr. CHARYK. Again to the best of our knowledge we cannot say there are not such cases in the program. Changing events might conceivably produce that situation. But we have to evolve things which we cannot anticipate at this time.

Mr. TURNER. We cannot tell you there is not a base in this program that will not be closed in 1961 or 1962, because something may change from what we now know, but to the best of our knowledge now, there is no such base in the program.

Mr. LAIRD. What kind of procedure do you use to close a base? I would like that reviewed.

Mr. CHARYK. I can discuss this.

General MINTON. We have an officer here who has the responsibility for keeping those procedures together.

Mr. CHARYK. You are interested in the criteria that we look at in analyzing potential closures?

Mr. LAIRD. I am interested in why you leak out the information so far in advance. Is it to try to build up a lot of local sentiment to keep certain bases open, or what is the reason for this?

Mr. CHARYK. You mean in terms of indicating the bases that are under consideration?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes. You use a much different procedure than the Navy, and I was interested in why the Air Force chose this means of

putting out information quite a bit in advance and trying to get people stirred up, and what you gained by that.

Mr. CHARYK. I might comment, in the first place, that from the standpoint of practical reality, it is a little difficult to keep completely secret the fact that you are looking at certain bases. When people come in to review the facility and it is well known that the Air Force program, let us say, is calling for a reduction in the number of B–47 wings and we start looking at specific B–47 bases, you cannot very well keep that a secret. We feel that it is important simply to acknowledge the fact, and also to prevent the expenditure on the part of communities, expenditures related to the base which might create a serious problem if very shortly thereafter we were to take action to close the base.

I would say, in the first place, there is just the practical reality that it is very difficult to keep these things secret.

Secondly, we do not think it would be particularly fair to permit a community to go ahead and enter into commitments and undertake expenditures knowing full well that within a very short time there is a high probability that we might take action to close the base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The determination of bases that have to be inactivated is obviously within the military control. Do you think it necessary to have any preconcept approach to the problem on the part of the military? What happened in there?

Mr. CHARYK. I think what we endeavor to do is to look at the changing military requirements, the changing picture as far ahead as we can see we look at the impact that will occur insofar as facilities are concerned and endeavor to move in such a fashion that we will arrive at an optimal solution—in other words, to try to obtain the maximum utilization of the best facilities that we have in terms of the kinds of program we see ahead.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I grant your criteria are proper. There is no question about that. That is confined, however, within the military scope for determination. You make recommendations and follow such course as you see fit and it is finalized. My question, in accordance with what my colleague and I are thinking about, that is a matter that is buttoned up within the Department of Defense itself. Up until the time you may have made the decision there and you see fit then to announce the decision, that is your area. How does the thing become public prior to that time? What happens in the transition which makes this public?

Mr. CHARYK. In the first place, I think you have the element at work that I mentioned earlier, namely, that when you actually have people inspecting bases who are known to be doing just that, there are rumors that are generated, and this becomes public information. We also do feel that it is proper that we should bring to the attention of the appropriate congressional people the problem areas that we see ahead.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But you have made your decision.

Mr. CHARYK. On which we have made our decision.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But not until the decision has been made.

Mr. CHARYK. Then the announcement is made to the appropriate congressional individuals.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, that is not the way they do it, though.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is not the policy which has been pursued. That is what we are inquiring about.

Mr. CHARYK. Let me add this point: There are discussions with appropriate congressional people so they are aware that there are considerations which could involve various bases, for example.

Mr. LAIRD. You have written letters to Members of Congress. These Members immediately come to talk to us as members of this committee. These letters are projected all the way until 1964 by the Air Force.

Mr. CHARYK. I do not think they are definitive insofar as 1964. I think by and large they may take the form that there will have to be a reduction in the number, for example, of B–47 bases. There will be a reduction, as we anticipate now, in these numbers over such-and-such a time period. These are the kinds of bases that could be affected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Again, if my colleague will permit an interjection, the point at issue here from my point of view, perhaps not my colleague's, is why make any announcement publicly until such time as you yourself have made your determinations, not contemplated but have made them? The contemplation aspect is the one which creates the problem.

Mr. CHARYK. We try to do the best job we can to make a decision public and simultaneously to have the proper notification to the interested congressional authorities.

Mr. TURNER. We are trying to ease the blow for him, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The point at issue is this, gentlemen, and I think I am in step with what the gentleman has in mind: You have a perfect right within your operation to pursue any investigation for any project or any station, to review it as to whether or not you should or should not eliminate it from the program. That is your privilege. There is no question about that, but why have publicity about that until such time as you have determined what you are going to do based upon the military concept of what should be done? That is the point at issue. We have had too much correspondence about this. We know it is creating a terrific turmoil, upon the basis of a contemplated action and not the final determination. That is the point at issue, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. CHARYK. There is this aspect which perhaps I might discuss a little further. For example, it is generally public information that the Air Force is reducing the number of B–47 squadrons and that the number of B–47 bases will have to be reduced. So automatically people who are concerned about particular B–47 bases and installations know that there is a distinct possibility that that base will be closed down or that it will be converted into a B–52 base or that something else will happen. I do not think that we are creating publicity by acknowledging the fact that this is one of the bases that is automatically under consideration.

I think we endeavor to be careful not to make any formal public announcement until such time as the decision has been firmed up. At this point we try to make, if possible, a simultaneous public announcement with notification to the appropriate individuals.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I think the Secretary fails to get the point here completely. The Air Force is writing letters before it is even asked, informing certain individuals that it is studying the possibility of closing this or that base in 1963, without even getting an inquiry about the base. Is that not correct?

Mr. CHARYK. I have no knowledge of a letter that says we are taking an action in 1963.

Mr. LAIRD. You know about the letters on 1962.

Mr. TURNER. Yes, there are some on 1962. Legislative Liaison has informed some.

Mr. LAIRD. There never has been a request for those letters.

Mr. TURNER. I do not know of any request.

Mr. LAIRD. What purpose does this serve? Do you want to get as many people stirred up as you can?

Mr. TURNER. To the contrary, that is exactly what we are trying not to do. If we were going to close a base in your district, Mr. Laird, I am sure you would want to know about it ahead of time. We are trying to ease the blow for the particular person involved.

(Off the record.)

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1960.

REPETITIVE ITEMS

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are going to take up repetitive items this morning.

We shall let you proceed with your statement without any interrogation until you have made your statement in its entirety.

General MINTON. We have these repetitive items. They are divided into three groups—the operations group, the maintenance group, and the flying safety group.

With your permission I would like Colonel Liles, representing the Director of Operations, to present those items having to do with the operational aspect; Colonel Stone will present the items having to do with maintenance, and General Caldara will present flying safety.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall proceed.

OPERATIONAL MISSION TRAINING BUILDING

Requirement: Provides training area for proficiency in operation and maintenance of aircraft and related equipment.

Scope varies from 2,200 to 32,000 square feet.

Cost varies from $59,000 to $827,000; total projects (15), $2,939,000.

Command requirement. SAC 14; Headquarters Command, 1.

Operations mission training

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	Grand Forks (SAC)	2,200	$80
	K. I. Sawyer (SAC)	2,200	80
	Kincheloe (SAC)	2,200	80
Air Materiel Command	Robins (SAC)	2,200	73
	Griffiss (SAC)	2,200	60
Air Training Command	Amarillo (SAC)	7,000	183
	Mather (SAC)	2,200	99
	Sheppard (SAC)	2,200	59
Headquarters Command	Andrews	32,000	827
Strategic Air Command	Blytheville	2,661	77
	Columbus	2,200	64
	Glasgow	2,200	80
	Wurthsmith	30,000	684
	Bunker Hill	16,075	423
	Dow	2,800	70
Total, 15 projects			2,939

Colonel LILES. The operations mission training building is the first repetitive item and is included in this program for 15 bases at $2,939,000. Fourteen of these are to support the SAC mission and one is in support of the crew-readiness training performed at Andrews AFB. They will provide the space to house flight simulators, field training equipment, and various other devices which are necessary for thorough continuous training of Air Force personnel with regard to proper and expert use of their equipment and retention of attained proficiency. New developments in the complicated aircraft and equipment now in use and improvements in operation and maintenance techniques require that adequate facilities be available for continuous training to improve capabilities and prevent excessive loss of man-hours.

Flight simulators are electromechanical trainers which reproduce the cockpit and complete flight decks of aircraft and simulate actual flight performance. They provide practice in normal and emergency flight procedures and in radio navigation, fire control, communications, and crew coordination. Considering the complexity of modern aircraft, there are many areas of flight training, particularly in emergency procedures, which cannot be accomplished with any other type of training without possible loss of life or material. The field training program requires qualified instructors with equipment such as operating displays, cutaway components, vugraphs, animated panels, etc., for the various systems of an aircraft.

Flight simulators and electromechanical trainers for these installations are presently in production and are quite expensive. For instance, a B–52G flight simulator costs approximately $1,100,000 and the KC–135 simulator approximately $800,000.

The size and cost of the operational mission training projects included in this program vary according to the specific base mission and associated training functions assigned and to the availability of suitable existing space. The larger of the projects are programed at bases scheduled to receive flight simulators and/or field training functions while the greater majority of the requested facilities of approximately 2,000 square feet will house electronic countermeasure trainers; cockpit procedure trainers and gunnery trainers; and devices scheduled for all bases which will have a strategic heavy bomber mission. Within

the Strategic Air Command, distribution of flight simulators and field training functions is made on an area basis to provide the best possible coverage with respect to a particular aircraft model. For example, the 30,000 square feet of space programed at Wurtsmith AFB will handle semiannual flight simulator training and field training for personnel at Wurtsmith, Kincheloe, and K. I. Sawyer AFB's together with electronic countermeasure, gunnery and cockpit procedure training for Wurtsmith only whereas the space requested at K. I. Sawyer and Kincheloe AFB is the normal 2,200 square feet for more frequent training such as gunnery.

A project requested for Bunker Hill AFB will provide the additional space necessary to accommodate B–58 and KC–135 simulators and training equipment to support the programed mission there.

The project at Andrews AFB will handle training requirements for rated USAF officers throughout the Washington area.

WING HEADQUARTERS BUILDINGS

SAC requirement provides administrative space for operation of strategic wing of bombers and tankers.
Scope varies 10,000 to 13,390 square feet.
Cost varies $216,000 to $453,000.
Total projects, 6.
Total cost, $1,735,000.

Headquarters wing

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	K. I. Sawyer (SAC)	10,050	250
	Kincheloe (SAC)	10,050	312
Air Materiel Command	Griffis (SAC)	10,050	250
	Robins (SAC)	10,050	254
Tactical Air Command	Seymour-Johnson (SAC)	10,000	216
Strategic Air Command	Glasgow	13,390	453
Total, 6 projects			1,735

Colonel LILES. The next item in the series is the wing headquarters building requested for 6 locations at a total cost of $1,735,000. All of these facilities are in support of the SAC mission.

The operation of a squadron of heavy bombers and a squadron of refueler aircraft at dispersed locations must be a coordinated and integrated function under the jurisdiction of one unit commander. For purposes of identification, the unit of bombers and tankers and related nonflying support squadrons at SAC dispersal bases is designated as a strategic wing. This terminology of a strategic wing does not supersede or duplicate the term of "wing" as used normally with reference to the total planned strategic heavy bomber B–52 force.

At SAC owned bases, approximately 246 people are assigned to the Strategic Wing Headquarters, however, about 143 of these personnel will work in locations other than the wing headquarters building. At bases where SAC is a tenant, the number of personnel assigned to the Strategic Wing is reduced to 219 since the host command assumes certain functions normally assigned to the Strategic Wing at SAC bases. Approximately 131 people assigned to the wing headquarters work in other locations.

The projects requested in this program will provide administrative space for 103 at SAC owned bases and 88 people at tenant bases. No available space exists to accommodate the requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your next witness.

General MINTON. Colonel Stone will cover maintenance.

PRECISION MEASURING EQUIPMENT LABORATORY

Requirement: Provides calibration and certification services for precise measuring equipment and tools.
Scope varies: 1400 to 1650 feet.
Cost varies: $32,000 to $65,000.
Total projects: 12.
Total cost: $542,000.
Location of items: ADC, 10; SAC, 1; AFE, 1.

Precision measurement equipment laboratories

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	Duluth	1,650	$47
	Grand Forks	1,650	49
	K. I. Sawyer	1,650	40
	Kingsley	1,650	48
	Kincheloe	1,650	40
	Minot	1,650	61
	Otis	1,650	40
	Paine	1,650	40
	Richard Gebaur	1,650	40
	Tyndall	1,650	40
Strategic Air Command	Glasgow	1,650	65
U.S. Air Forces, Europe	Incirlik	1,400	32
Total, 12 projects			542

Colonel STONE. Nine of the repetitive items in this military construction program are in support of maintenance functions.

The first item is the precision measurement equipment laboratory in support of the calibration standards program. This budget requests the construction of precision measurement equipment laboratories on 12 bases for a total cost of $542,000. The facility is approximately 1,600 square feet in area and ranges in cost from $32,000 to $65,000, depending on utility requirements and site location. These facilities are part of an Air Force-wide calibration system, planned in cooperation and close coordination with the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau is at the apex of the structure and provides the national primary standards as a common reference for all measurements. The complete calibration system will be comprised (in descending order of accuracy) of the Bureau of Standards, the Air Force Standards Calibration Facility at Heath, Ohio; depot level standards laboratories at 16 AF locations, and approximately 160 base level facilities which we call precision measurement equipment laboratories. The function of each of these facilities is to provide calibration services for those standards or testing devices employed at the next lower echelon. Through this concept, measurement standardization and compatibility will be insured for all phases of Air Force maintenance, operational testing, and quality assurance.

The calibration program has been based on economic, technical administrative, and logistical considerations. Laboratory locations have

been selected to satisfy workload requirements and the geographical complexities of the program.

Modern military equipment has enormously increased the requirement for measuring and testing devices. Hundreds of thousands of these devices are in use and must be kept in good repair and calibrated periodically with a certified standard of known accuracy. Measurements must now be made routinely, at base level, with accuracies that a decade ago, were generally attainable only in the environment of research and development activities. It is at this level that the precision measurement equipment laboratories in this program are required.

Stringently controlled laboratory conditions are necessary to achieve these high accuracies. The top Air Force facility, to be located at Heath, Ohio, must have extremely precise control over temperature, pressure, humidity, and cleanliness and requires the highest order of seismic stability. Although environmental conditions in laboratories at lower echelons can be less stringent, they still must meet rigid standards of cleanliness, temperature, humidity, and stability.

Maximum use is being made of existing structures where they can be modified economically to meet the exacting environmental requirements for these laboratories. Approximately 85 percent of the 176 locations (160 bases plus 16 depot level locations) will establish calibration facilities by modification of existing structures. A major portion of this effort has already been accomplished or is underway. Laboratories are in operation where this work is completed. There will be a continuing need to upgrade these facilities to keep up with advances in technology which are generating requirements for increasing orders of accuracy in maintenance of military equipment.

AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS

SAC requirement: Provides maintenance cover for wing and fuselage sections of large aircraft.
17 projects: 34 docks.
Cost varies: $246,000 to $599,000 (per dock).
Total cost: $15,062,000. Higher cost includes dock procurement.

Aircraft maintenance docks (large)

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
			Thousands
Air Defense Command	Grand Forks (SAC)	2 each	$1,073
	K. I. Sawyer (SAC)	do	866
	Kincheloe (SAC)	do	903
	Minot (SAC)	do	1,198
Air Materiel Command	Robins (SAC)	do	650
	Wright-Patterson (SAC)	do	700
Air Research and Development Command.	Eglin (SAC)	1 each	386
Air Training Command	Mather (SAC)	2 each	1,067
Strategic Air Command	Beale	3 each	1,200
	Blytheville	2 each	691
	Clinton-Sherman	do	909
	Columbus	do	908
	Glasgow	do	1,100
	March	do	1,000
	Turner	do	844
	Wurtsmith	do	977
	Seymour-Johnson	do	700
Total, (17 projects, 34 docks).			15,062

Colonel STONE. The second item is "Aircraft maintenance docks" for SAC aircraft. There are 34 docks programed at 17 locations for a total cost of $15,062,000. These facilities are preengineered steel frame, metal-sided structures which provide the necessary maintenance cover for the fuselage and wing sections of aircraft in the most economical method available.

Prior military construction programs have contained requests for authorization of various maintenance shops at SAC dispersal locations. When a need for additional shops was determined, a theoretical requirement for more maintenance cover was also recognized, but adequate experience factors were not available at that time to substantiate the calculations. Extensive tests and normal dispersed operations have now verified the necessity for 7 covered spaces to support a 15 B–52 and 10 KC–135 mission and 8 docks to support a 15 B–52 and 20 KC–135 mission. It will be noted, however, that the Air Force is not requesting authorization to construct to the full deficiency, since efforts are constantly being made to reduce the in-dock maintenance time by improved procedures and increased personnel proficiency gained through training and experience.

The wide variance in unit cost of the item is due to the fact that in some cases the docks are available and being moved from one base to another. In the higher cost projects the procurement cost of the dock is included.

POWERED GROUND EQUIPMENT SHOP

Requirement: Provides working area for inspection, repair, maintenance and servicing of equipment used for ground operation of aircraft equipment and accessories.

Size varies from 4,300 square feet to 13,000 square feet.

Cost varies from $95,000 to $269,000.

Total projects (13), $1,849,000.

Location of items: ADC, 6; MTC, 1; SAC, 4; TAC, 1; ATC, 1.

Shop, ground powered equipment

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	Hamilton	4,574	$160
	Kincheloe	5,000	159
	Kincheloe (addition)	4,300	100
	Otis	8,600	169
	Paine	4,574	138
	Tyndall	13,000	269
Air Training Command	Amarillo (SAC)	5,278	115
	Mather (SAC)	5,278	139
	Moody	4,574	95
Military Transport Service	Dover	4,300	129
Strategic Air Command	Bunker Hill	5,705	139
Tactical Air Command	Seymour Johnson	5,000	123
	Seymour Johnson (SAC)	5,000	123
Total (13 projects)			1,849

Colonel STONE. The third repetitive item is the powered ground equipment shop. There are 13 programed at a total cost of $1,849,000 ranging in size from 4,300 square feet to 13,000 square feet. At one time powered ground equipment was processed in the automotive shops. At that time the equipment consisted of relatively simple

mechanical processes which were actually comparable to the vehicular equipment. With the advent of the Century series fighters, higher performance bombers, and new cargo aircraft, the necessary powered ground equipment has increased in numbers, sizes, and complexity.

The new powered ground equipment includes nonautomotive features such as gas turbine engines and extremely high pressure hydraulic systems. Gas turbine engines are the same type engines as those used to power the aircraft, and they require the same skills to maintain them. Powered ground equipment has become so complex that it is not compatible with the automotive system of maintenance. For example, 1 fighter interceptor aircraft in use today has radio and electronic equipment comparable to 100 radios and 100 television sets. One electric motor driven generator must furnish the power for this interceptor during the time that maintenance is being accomplished. Automotive skills, tools, and equipment are not adequate for powered ground equipment which has become as complex as the aircraft it serves.

Existing structures quite often do not have the floor loading capacity or door sizes to accommodate this new heavy equipment. These same structures might not be capable of supporting overhead hoists and monorails necessary for maintenance on powered ground equipment. Maintenance of this equipment requires rewiring of existing structures to provide the required power. When the costs of these modifications are totaled for some existing structures they exceed the cost of new buildings. The important point is that when all these modifications are completed the resultant facility is still barely adequate for powered ground equipment maintenance.

The size of the powered ground equipment shops is based on the number and types of pieces of equipment programed to be assigned to the using organization. Each piece of powered ground equipment receives periodic inspections similar to aircraft inspections. In addition, each piece of equipment is inspected daily.

SHOP REFUELING VEHICLE

Requirement: Provides facility for servicing and repairing refueling tanker trucks and trailers. Size varies, 2,116 square feet to 3,516 square feet. Cost varies, $54,000 to $139,000.

Ten projects, $924,000. Location of items: ADC, 1; SAC, 5; ATC, 2; PAF, 1; MTC, 1.

Shops, refueling vehicle

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	Minot	2,776	$139
Military Transport Services	Charleston	2,196	64
Air Training Command	Webb	3,516	129
	Moody	3,516	90
Strategic Air Command	Blytheville	2,196	95
	Glasgow	2,196	101
	Offutt	2,116	103
	Turner	2,246	54
	Whiteman	2,116	88
Pacific Air Forces	Osan	2,914	61
Total, 10 projects			924

Colonel STONE. The fourth item is the refueling vehicle shop. This facility is programed for 10 bases at a total cost of $924,000. They vary in size from approximately 2,000 square feet to a little over 3,000 square feet and vary in cost from $54,000 to $139,000. The cost of the facilities, generally speaking, varies directly with the size.

The refueling vehicle shop provides an explosionproof shop area for maintenance of engines, pumps, hoses, segregators, strainers, and other items pertaining to refueling vehicles. Gasoline trucks and trailers, whether loaded or empty, cannot be stored in hangars or other buildings not specifically designed for that purpose, since they constitute a potential fire hazard. Further, refueling vehicles may not enter regular maintenance shops unless they have been previously purged, a process requiring about 24 hours of constant steam cleaning plus the wastage of a certain amount of fuel per vehicle. Such a process each month in order to inspect the vehicle is impractical and wasteful. Any attempt to perform this work outside would result in fuel contamination and thereby generate aircraft accidents. The Air Force is continuously striving for pure fuel through a constant high degree of quality control in all areas of fuel handling. Contamination of filters and separators when opened in elements of weather is obvious.

CORROSION CONTROL FACILITIES

Requirement: To provide quick and efficient corrosion control on A/C.
Covered facility—4 at $400,000, total $1,600,000.
Open facility—6, $1,001,000; size, from 2,740 to 4,540 SY; cost, from $102,000 to $210,000.
Modified project—1, $94,000.
Total projects—11, $2,695,000.

Corrosion control facility

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
			Thousands
Strategic Air Command	Wurtsmith (covered)	1 each	$400
	Beale	do	150
	Blytheville	do	193
	Clinton-Sherman	do	102
	Columbus	do	141
	March (MOD)	do	94
Air Defense Command	Grand Forks (SAC) (covered)	do	400
	K. I. Sawyer (SAC) (covered)	do	400
	Kincheloe (SAC) (covered)	do	400
Air Training Command	Amarillo (SAC)	do	205
	Sheppard (SAC)	do	210
Total, 11 projects			2,695

Colonel STONE. The fifth item is aircraft corrosion control facilities which are all SAC requirements. The projects for open corrosion control facilities at seven bases cost $1,095,000 (one of which is a modification project) and covered corrosion control facilities at four bases cost $1,600,000. The cost of these vary from $102,000 to $400,000 depending on size, design configuration and supporting facilities.

The corrosion control facilities are specifically designed to permit the anticorrosion treatment of aircraft quickly and efficiently. To

accomplish this function, the design provides connections for hot and cold water, electric power, compressed air and cleaning solvent, and incorporates drainage facilities for the disposal of large quantities of water, oils, alkalies, salts, hydroxides, and other substances.

The need for such facilities is basic. Aircraft must be kept clean and corrosion free at all times. This is necessary so that daily and periodic inspections can reveal all areas of required maintenance. A dirty or corroded aircraft will hide leaking lines and connections, ultimately resulting in aircraft accident such as fires and failure of components to operate. Periodic corrosion control of aircraft will reduce aircraft fires and accidents and at the same time increase the quality of maintenance, thereby increasing the operational readiness of the deterrent force. A point often overlooked is the additional drag in an aircraft which has corroded skin. This additional drag increases fuel consumption and decreases combat range resulting in decreased combat effectiveness.

At bases with heavy aircraft the request is for 4,540 square yards of pavement. Due to climatic conditions at northern bases(Grand Forks, K. I. Sawyer, Kincheloe, and Wurtsmith) the wash racks are covered and are listed in this request as covered corrosion control facilities. Like facilities for other bases will be requested in future programs as the requirements are justified.

SHOP, ARMAMENT AND ELECTRONICS

Requirement: provides for maintenance and repair of equipment and accessories used in aircraft for airborne communications, armament, cameras, bombing systems ECM, and NAV system.

Project	*Cost range thousands*
9 new	$79–$375
18 additions	106– 189
3 modifications	150– 175
Total, 30 projects	5, 240, 000

Location of items:

ADC	7
SAC	17
AFE	3
PAF	3

Shop, armament, and electronics

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	Geiger	12,650	$348
	Grand Forks	4,650	170
	K. I. Sawyer	4,650	170
	Kincheloe	4,650	170
	Minot	4,650	170
	Oxnard	[1]	150
	Selfridge	12,650	375
	Suffolk County	[1]	150
Air Materiel Command	Griffiss	4,650	127
	Robins	4,650	116
	Wright-Patterson	4,650	127
Air Research and Development Command	Eglin (SAC)	4,650	126
Air Training Command	Amarillo (SAC)	4,650	106
	Mather (SAC)	4,650	122
	Sheppard (SAC)	4,650	129
Strategic Air Command	Beale	4,650	124
	Blytheville	4,650	126
	Castle (ADC)	12,650	300
	Columbus	3,888	101
	Dow (ADC)	6,836	189
	Glasgow	4,650	141
	Wurtsmith	4,650	168
Tactical Air Command	England (ADC)	12,650	272
	Seymour-Johnson (SAC)	4,650	114
U.S. Air Force—Europe	Bentwaters	12,550	271
	Hahn	12,400	248
	Ramstein	4,732	90
Pacific Air Forces	Kadena	12,550	286
	Naha	3,378	79
	Yokota	27,650	175
Total, 30 projects			5,240

[1] Lump sum.

Colonel STONE. The armament and electronic shop is the sixth item to be discussed. This item is included in the program for 30 bases at a total cost of $5,240,000. These projects vary in cost from $79,000 to $375,000. There are 9 new facilities, 18 additions, and 3 modifications which explains the large project cost variance.

This facility will provide a central shop for both field and organizational type maintenance of armament and electronic equipment. This includes airborne communications equipment, armament, small arms, cameras, bombing systems, fire control system, enemy counter measures, and navigational equipment.

Due to the extreme delicacy and sensitivity of the equipment maintained, a completely air-conditioned dust-proof environment is required. A supply of reliable electrical power with precise frequency and voltage control is necessary during checking and calibration of components. The successful performance of this shop function is the key to having mission aircraft combat ready.

In the armament and electronics shop, components are repaired and tested. In the aircraft calibration shelter (the next item I will discuss) the airframes, the fire control system, and the armament are checked and calibrated together as an integrated weapon. The function performed in the calibration shelter is therefore a necessary follow-on to the work done in the armament and electronic shop.

AIRCRAFT WEAPONS CALIBRATION SHELTER

Requirement: Provides shelter for bore-sighting and harmonization of installed A/C weapons fire control systems.

	Project	Cost range
1,920 square feet	3	$48,000–$168,000
6,140 square feet	3	161,000–250,000
Addition	1	49,000
Total	7	950,000

Location of items:
Air Defense Command, 6.
Pacific Air Forces, 1.

Weapons calibration shelter

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	Hamilton	1,242	$49
	McChord	6,140	210
	Oxnard	1,920	48
	Paine	6,140	250
	Suffolk County	6,140	161
Tactical Air Command	England (ADC)	1,920	64
Pacific Air Forces	Clark	1,920	168
Total, 7 projects			950

Colonel STONE. The aircraft weapons calibration shelter which is programed for seven bases at a total estimated cost of $950,000 is the seventh repetitive item. Two different variations of the basic design are used. One is an open shelter for warm climates. The second is a closed facility designed for cold climates. This program contains four of the open type and three of the enclosed type.

This facility will provide space for performing scheduled and unscheduled bore sighting and harmonization of installed fixed firing control systems for fighter interceptor aircraft. Conventional maintenance hangars and docks construction creates radar interference. In addition, the normal location of hangars and docks does not permit the required 1,500-foot clear area from the aircraft to a reflector target.

Due to the complexity of equipment, protection from the elements must be provided. During inclement weather, aircraft must be bore sighted or harmonized under shelter to preclude moisture, dust and/or wind damage to critical, delicate installed electronic equipment which must be uncovered during maintenance and inspection operations. Suitable temperature and humidity controls must be provided in a small room for benchwork on component parts of the intricate fire control system. Aircraft must be raised on jacks to level the airframe for bore sighting of the armament and harmonization of the installed fire control systems. This phase of operation cannot be performed on ramps or taxiways because of the danger of the aircraft being blown off jacks or damage to armament doors and bays caused by external winds.

Experience at bases now using these facilities has demonstrated the

value of the structure in terms of the accuracy and effectiveness of the aircraft, fire control equipment and armament as an integrated defense weapon.

AIRCRAFT READY SHELTERS

Requirement: To cover and protect operational ready fighter-interceptor aircraft from the elements—8 projects; 27 shelters, cost varies, $31,000 to $168,000 (per shelter); total cost, $2,327,000. Location of items: ADC, 3; AFE, 1; PAF, 4.

Aircraft shelter ready

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
			Thousands
Pacific Air Forces	Clark	2 each	$164
	Kunsan	8 each	350
	Osan	5 each	400
	Tainan	2 each	227
Air Training Command	Webb (ADC)	do	237
Air Defense Command	Paine	4 each	670
U.S. Air Forces, Europe	Spangdahlem	2 each	61
Tactical Air Command	England (ADC)	do	218
Total, 8 projects			2,327

Colonel STONE. The eighth item is the aircraft ready shelters which are programed at 8 locations for a total cost of $2,327,000 and provides 27 shelters, each of which is capable of providing for 2 aircraft. The costs vary from $31,000 to $168,000 per shelter.

In order for a fighter-interceptor squadron to meet their operational requirements it is necessary that a majority of the aircraft be combat ready at all times. To assure this availability four aircraft are kept on an alert status at all times and the balance in the state of readiness. Alert aircraft are sheltered in a facility known as an alert hangar and in areas of adverse weather conditions ready aircraft shelters are provided for the aircraft in readiness.

A ready aircraft shelter is a garage-type structure of approximately 90 by 100 feet. Shelters are of minimum construction, sufficient to withstand the pressures caused by jet-engine blasts. Exterior walls and roof are sheet metal on a steel frame with each shelter providing cover for two interceptor-type aircraft. Manually operated doors are provided on the front and rear of the shelters in order to provide a pullthrough operation. No facilities for personnel are included, and service utilities are the minimum required. Heating of the shelter is not anticipated and interior lighting is at a minimum. Construction of shelters in side-by-side multiples on existing pavement is accomplished where possible. Sheltering of combat-ready interceptor aircraft is necessary to protect sensitive electronic equipment from the weather elements.

An alert hangar which provides shelter for four fighter-interceptor aircraft and their crews is normally sited at the end of the runway so that the alert aircraft can become airborne in a maximum time of 3 minutes upon receipt of a scramble order.

In contrast ready aircraft shelters are located back on the mass parking apron, provides no facilities for aircraft crews, and are a ready not an alert facility with the aircraft becoming airborne within a maximum of 15 minutes.

Although this facility is related to the alert hangar in that it is required to provide cover for the fighter-interceptors that must be operationally ready, it is not a duplication of the alert hangar but rather supplements it.

ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOPS

Requirement: provides for buildup, disassembly, field repair, testing, and storage of aircraft engines.

Scope varies from 12,800 square feet to 31,838 square feet; cost varies from $240,000 to $617,000; total projects, 11; total cost, $3,834,000. Location of items: ADC, 1; ATC, 2; SAC, 8.

Shop, a/c engine inspection and repair

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Square feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	McChord	26,500	$502
	Selfridge (SAC)	12,800	252
Air Training Command	Amarillo (SAC)	18,344	247
	Mather (SAC)	18,970	269
	Moody	31,838	488
	Perrin	31,838	617
	Sheppard (SAC)	18,970	273
Strategic Air Command	Dow	15,868	278
	Glasgow	15,300	330
	Wurthsmith	15,211	240
Tactical Air Command	Seymour-Johnson (SAC)	18,970	338
Total, 11 projects			3,834

Colonel STONE. The ninth and last item, the engine inspection and repair shops, which are programed at 11 bases for a total cost of $3,834,000, vary in size from 12,800 square feet to 31,838 square feet. The wide variance in size accounts for the wide range in cost from $240,000 to $617,000. Engines are removed from aircraft for the following reasons: correction of a malfunction; periodic inspection; and/or for accomplishment of time compliance technical orders. New engines are delivered unassembled and consequently must be built up in the engine shop. For example, 27 engines are normally processed through the engine shop each month for a 15 B–52/10 KC–135 mission. Upon completion of the maintenance or buildup of the engines they are tested and then stored ready for immediate placement on aircraft. If required repairs are too extensive to be performed at base level, then accessories are removed and the engines are shipped to a depot.

FLIGHT-SAFETY ITEMS

General MINTON. We have General Caldara with us who is responsible for the Air Force flying safety program. These items on runway lighting are primarily flying safety items. I know he will not tell you this but the Air Force now has the lowest accident record we have ever had even though we have far more complicated aircraft than we ever had in the past. A great deal of this is due to General Caldara's dedication to the type of thing he will show you.

General CALDARA. With the chairman's permission I would like to take about 5 minutes to talk about the accident-prevention effort in the Air Force, and then move directly into the runway lighting.

First, the single mission of the Air Force Office of Safety is to conserve the combat capability of the Air Force. We try to do this through prevention of accidents. People talk about safety. Safety is only relative. No matter where we are we are surrounded by danger. What we must do then is apply our training, our experience, and our facilities to minimize those factors of danger to make the operation, whatever, it might be—whether driving a car or flying an aircraft—more safe. We do this in the Air Force. We have been trying to do it very much.

I would like to take a couple of minutes to show the current status of our accident-prevention methods, the results to date and relate these specifically to the problem of runway lighting.

We are going to compare for the record the first quarter of 1960 to the first quarter of 1959.

The total number of major accidents we reduced from 195 in the first 3 months of the calendar year 1959 to 123; a reduction of 37 percent. Now the gross number of accidents that may be reduced can be effected by a reduction in flying time, so we measure every year the number of major accidents against 100,000 hours of flying to give us a factor which gives us a constant figure. The factor or rate was reduced from 9.9 in 1959 to 6.6, or a reduction of 33 percent—very close to the reduction in the gross number of accidents.

Our fatal accidents were reduced 44 percent; from 52 to 29.

Pilot fatalities were reduced 45 percent; 55 to 35.

In discussions I have been asked the question, "What is the dollar value you place on a pilot's life?"

I have never attempted to answer. The only thing I ever say is, "Ask the widow and children." I cannot put a dollar value on a pilot's life.

Total fatalities have been reduced from 107 to 64. I would remind the chairman and the committee that last year our total pilot fatalities were much lower than the fatalities suffered by civil carriers.

Aircraft destroyed—and here we get to a definite dollar reduction—was from 141 down to 85, a reduction of 40 percent. In spite of the fact the inventory continues to go more and more supersonic in the fighters, we have been able by applying positive-action prevention efforts, not only in the area of training and experience and supervision but also in the area of facilities, which I will talk to in a few minutes, we have cut them down.

In phases of operation, in 1959 we had 2 accidents in taxiing and 1960, 3; takeoffs, in 1959 we had 38 and it went down to 14; inflight, 70 down to 46; landing accidents, 76 down to 54. You will notice this reduction in landing accidents is not quite as good as the other reductions and there is a reason for this.

Go-arounds, from eight to four.

Others, one up to two.

54569—60—pt. 2——5

I want to talk about the type of aircraft. Out of a total of 123 accidents we had in the first 3 months, 103 were involved in jet bombers, jet fighters, and jet trainers. This is not mere happenstance. The 103 out of 123 are because of the higher performance of this equipment and in turn the higher requirement that this equipment places upon the pilot, or the crew.

I use the chart only to make this point that out of 123 accidents, 103 were involved in jets.

APPROACH LIGHTS AND NARROW GAGE CENTERLINE LIGHTS

Approach Lighting

Flying safety requirement: Provides improved visual aid for safe and efficient operation of high performance aircraft.

	Projects	Cost range
3,000 feet	19	$166,000–$515,000
1,500 feet	17	57,000–245,000
Extensions	4	91,000–170,000
Modifications	3	38,000–306,000
Total	43	8,378,000

Location of projects:		Location of projects—Continued		Location of projects—Continued	
ADC	7	AU	1	MTC	1
AMC	2	SAC	18	PAF	7
ARDC	1	TAC	2	ACW	1
ATC	2	AAC	1		

Runway Lighting

Narrow gage and centerline flying safety requirement: Provides improved visual aid for landing aircraft during extreme weather conditions.

Scope, 1 each; cost varies, $336,000 to $463,000; total bases, 12; total cost, $4,441,000; location of items: ADC, 3; AMC, 1; ATC, 2; SAC, 6.

Lighting, runway, NGCL

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
			Thousands
Air Defense Command	Kincheloe	Lump sum	$336
	Minot	do	350
	Selfridge	do	367
Strategic Air Command	Bunker	1 each	350
	Fairchild	do	350
	Forbes	do	350
	Homestead	do	463
	Loring	do	425
	March	do	350
Air Training Command	James Connally	Lump sum	350
	Mather	do	400
Air Materiel Command	Griffiss	do	350
Total, 12 projects			4,441

Lighting approach

Command	Installation	Scope	Amount
		Feet	*Thousands*
Air Defense Command	Geiger	(1)	$38
	Kincheloe	1,500	57
	Oxnard	3,000	218
	Paine	3,000	439
	Richard-Gebaur	600	91
	Selfridge	1,500	157
	Suffolk County	1,500	68
Air Materiel Command	Griffiss	1,475	153
	McClellan	3,000	320
Air Research and Development Command	Eglin	3,000	203
Air Training Command	Perrin	3,000	288
	Sheppard (SAC)	1,500	113
	Webb	3,000	325
Air University	Maxwell	3,000	166
Alaskan Air Command	Eielson	3,000	515
Military Air Transport Service	Scott	3,000	255
Pacific Air Forces	Yokota	3,000	218
	Itazuke	3,000	240
	Kunsan	3,000	326
	Misawa	3,000	226
	Misawa	3,000	218
	Osan	3,000	311
	Yokota	3,000	218
Strategic Air Command	Barksdale	1,400	122
	Barksdale	3,000	175
	Bergstrom	1,500	193
	Blytheville	1,500	101
	Carswell	1,000	170
	Clinton-Sherman	1,500	117
	Columbus	1,500	97
	Dow	1,500	128
Strategic Air Command	Ellsworth	3,000	280
	Do	1,500	195
	Fairchild	3,000	208
	Forbes	1,500	150
	Glasgow	1,500	129
	Mountain Home	1,500	176
	Plattsburgh	1,500	80
	Whiteman	1,500	134
	Wurtsmith	1,500	57
Aircraft control and warning system	Stewart	1,500	245
Tactical Air Command	England	2,500	306
	Myrtle Beach	2,500	152
Total, 43 projects			8,378

[1] Lump sum.

General CALDARA. The repetitive item I will discuss is a combination of the approach lights and the narrow gage centerline lighting system. There are 43 projects at a total cost of $8,378,000 in the program for the approach lights which range from three modification projects to installation of new systems of 3,000-foot and 1,500-foot additions. The variations in the cost of each project is dependent on the length of the system or the amount of modification to be done.

The high speed landing characteristics of modern aircraft magnify the hazards of landing, particularly during periods of adverse weather when the ceiling is low and visibility is poor. For instance, only a relatively few years ago such aircraft as the B–29 or B–50 had a landing approach speed of about 135 miles per hour. Newer bombers, such as the B–52 have a landing approach speed of 175 miles per hour. In the case of fighter aircraft, the approach speeds of the F–86 and F–80, which were 135 to 150 miles per hour, have increased to 195 miles per hour in the F–100 and F–104.

The approach lighting system being requested in this program is the one developed after many years of study on the configuration and hardware best suited to meet the operating needs of our modern military and civil aircraft. It is designed to improve efficiency, regularity and safety of landings under all weather conditions. The need for an improved system is emphasized by the fact that, for the period of 1950 through the first quarter of 1960 there were 48 accidents with a loss in hardware of $24,420,015 in which inadequate lighting was a contributing factor. These accidents accounted for 12 fatalities, 17 injured, and 25 aircraft destroyed.

Our old system was only 1,500 feet long with the lights in the inner 1,000 feet mounted along the extended edges of the runway. The 1,500 feet, adequate for yesterday's aircraft, doesn't suit the need of high landing speed aircraft since human reaction is an unchanging factor. It is necessary that our 1,000-foot overruns be kept clear of hazards and until now there were no flush lights available for centerline use in this area.

Where old style approach lighting systems are existing they are to be modified by installation of flush mounted centerline hardware in the overrun area, installation of an additional 1,500 feet of the sealed beam type lights, and installation of the flashing lights. The crossbar now existing and the area 500 feet beyond the overrun require no change.

The approach lighting system now adopted by all aviation agencies as the U.S. standard is as simple as practicable to meet the needs of high landing speed aircraft. It consists of a series of sealed beam reflector type lamps, similar in shape to those used on automobiles. These are placed in groups of five at intervals of 100 feet out along the extended centerline of the runway for a distance of 3,000 feet. A set of flashing stroboscopic lights, of very high candlepower, are superimposed on the system to flash in sequence toward the runway like a traveling arrow. These flashers are unique. When a pilot sees them there is no possibility of his confusing these lights with others in the general area of the landing field. Another component of the U.S. standard system is called the crossbar. This is a 100-foot long line of lights 1,000 feet out from the runway end. This gives the pilot definite knowledge of his position and at this point the final decision to either land or pull up is made.

Compatible with this new system are the narrow gage centerline lights of which there are 12 projects programed at a cost of $4,441,000. These projects range in price from $336,000 to $463,000 depending on the type of system being installed in existing runways or in a new runway. This item is one of the essential components of approach and landing system required at bases which have been designated as an area "safe haven" for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely bad weather conditions.

After crossing the threshold lights on his approach for landing, a pilot frequently loses accurate visual contact because the runway lights are from 100 to 150 feet on either side of the centerline of the runway. The narrow gage lighting system consists of two parallel rows of high intensity light bars 60 feet apart equidistant from the centerline of the runway spaced 200 feet apart longitudinally for about the first 3,000 feet. This is the landing zone of the runway. The centerline lighting system begins at this point and consists of lights spaced 10

feet apart along the runway centerline for the remainder of the runway. These lights permit accurate directional control of the aircraft during normal deceleration.

I have not touched on the cost of these items. I do not know whether this is pertinent to this particular discussion, but first I would like to say that from 1950 to date we have had 48 accidents. We feel approach or runway lighting has been one of the factors involved at a cost in hardware of $24,420,015. Inadequate lighting was the contributing factor. These accidents accounted for 12 fatalities, 17 injured, and 25 aircraft destroyed. The narrow gage centerline lights have been estimated here at $4,411,000 for the 12 projects programed. The cost of the approach lighting has been estimated here at $8,378,000. We are talking here on the order of some $12 or $13 million which is a lot of money. I appreciate that this type of lighting is more expensive, but this is the one place that means life or death to the pilot and crew, or the passengers. The best approach control system in the world, GCA or ILS, or anything else, will not be worth anything if the pilot does not make a proper approach in the final few moments and the proper touchdown on the runway. We are talking now in the last 8 years of $24 million loss in hardware alone. This does not include hospitalization and retraining the people. This particular area alone I feel, from a safety standpoint, as well as from an operational standpoint, is vital to the Air Force program.

General MINTON. That completes the repetitive items.

SAC DISPERSAL MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year you testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that the fiscal year 1960 program was the last increment in the SAC dispersal maintenance program. What is the reason for this request for additional funds for this program?

Colonel STONE. Last year's testimony is as the chairman stated. The ground-support equipment shops and the engine-buildup shops in this program are only fallout requirements that were not allowed to be filled due to the dollar limitation. As I mentioned in my presentation to you, at the time we made the shop program we knew we had a dock requirement but we did not have the experience data available. We did not request docks last year. Does that answer the question?

Mr. SHEPPARD. What actually is the total program?

Colonel STONE. For the SAC dispersal program?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel STONE. These items requested in this program will meet the SAC dispersal program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you presented here will finalize this program; is that correct?

Colonel STONE. Yes, sir: we have here the shop fallout from the previous year plus our dock requirements. This makes up the SAC maintenance dispersal requirements.

REVIEW FOR UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What specific review has been made of this program especially as regards the utilization of existing facilities since last year?

Colonel PARKHILL. These so-called fallout shop projects that Colonel Stone mentioned have been restudied by the bases, have been processed through normal programing procedures, requirements reevaluated, onbase assets restudied, and these have been submitted in the new program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What home-base facilities will remain if this program is approved?

Colonel STONE. The current home-base facilities that are in existence will remain.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would occur to me that due to the established availability you had in this general field last year that through the inauguration of this process you would be lessening your workload on your so-called overhaul and maintenance.

Colonel STONE. I don't understand, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would seem to be obvious that you would lessen your workload in the shops.

Colonel STONE. This is a true statement, sir.

The next followup question is, obviously, what will we do with the shops.

For example, the Sky chief program, which is at the SAC bases, is being done only at home bases. You have not heard us request additional facilities for Sky Chief. This is an example of the type of work we are doing at the home bases.

Some of the reprograming will allow multiple command on some of the home bases, but we will use those facilities rather than ask for new facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year the committee was definitely critical of your program for ground-power equipment shops. Can you assure us you have made a survey of each of the bases in this program, and that this is the specific amount of space required at each installation?

Colonel STONE. That is correct, sir. As I mentioned, this would be an ensuing program. You will see requirements for this in the coming years. That is why I attempted to present to the committee this year the magnitude of this program.

We are no longer maintaining ground powered equipment in the vehicle shop. You can see from the exhibits we have shown you that this equipment is now comparable to an aircraft, and therefore we maintain it under aircraft maintenance philosophy.

On July 1, 1959, we rewrote the basic maintenance manual (AFM 66–1). Where it had heretofore been applicable only to aircraft, we wrote into it ground support equipment. Ground equipment now is maintained under the same philosophy as the aircraft. It is maintained in the field maintenance squadron and not in the automotive shop.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the criteria that you applied in reviewing these mechanical requirements?

Colonel STONE. The number of pieces of ground support equipment and the type of ground support equipment allocated to the base, which is in the UAL (equipment authorization list).

As an example, in an F–100 base, one I know offhand, per 25 aircraft per squadron you receive 8 multipurpose servicing units and 3MJ3 hydraulic test stands. We go on with this type of specific numbers of equipment authorized in the listings. So many pieces of equipment give you so many square feet of floor space required.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How carefully do you review this setup, General Minton, especially in the way of utilizing existing facilities?

General MINTON. I have not, from the standpoint of utilization of existing facilities. I reviewed it from the standpoint of unit costs and utility costs, but not from the standpoint of facilities requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who has considered existing facilities in order to reach this level of appropriation requests? Somewhere along the line somebody has done that.

Colonel STONE. We in maintenance have looked at the existing facilities. As an example, taking Shaw Air Force Base, you will find only a cover there. A year and a half ago at Castle we were in a facility that was a holdover wooden construction garage, off base. You have to go down the county road in order to get to this facility. We even had to refuel outside in 1942 style, pumping from a drum into the ground support equipment, and then move it from there to the line.

We have looked at existing facilities. In many cases we are attempting to modify existing facilities. Where possible the requirement will not come before the committee.

General MINTON. In addition to the maintenance people's review, we have a Military Construction Panel consisting of representatives from all the interested staff officers; and they have also reviewed the facilities available on the base, not from the standpoint of visiting the base but from the inventory of buildings available on the base.

BASIS FOR ESTABLISHING AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the monthly flying hour per aircraft used as a basis for establishing your aircraft maintenance dock requirement?

Colonel STONE. What is the flying hour program?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right; hours per aircraft used as a basis for establishing your aircraft maintenance dock requirement?

Colonel STONE. It is calculated by a formula which we will be glad to submit for the record. We consider period of inspection, hours flown, periodic cycle between inspection. That is why we need flying time allocation, to tell how often you will have a periodic inspection. Then we have the number of man-hours to make a periodic inspection and the number of calendar days you get.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, look at the question and see if you cannot give me a more definite answer, please.

Colonel STONE. We will be glad to.

(The information requested follows:)

Aircraft maintenance dock requirements for SAC are calculated on a basis of 40 flying hours per month per aircraft. The formula for computing aircraft maintenance spaces required is as follows:

$$S=\frac{A\times T\times H}{F\times 176}$$

S—spaces required.
A—number of aircraft.
T—flying hours per month per aircraft.
H—hours in dock for the inspection.
F—frequency of inspection in terms of flying hours.
176—work hours available per month (22 days per month times 8 hours per day).

Total spaces required for a given base are determined by applying the above formula for each type of aircraft.

USE OF FUEL CELL REPAIR FACILITIES AND MAINTENANCE DOCKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration are you giving to the use of fuel cell repair facilities in lieu of, or in addition to, maintenance docks?

Colonel STONE. We have a requirement being generated now on fuel cell repair. Where possible we will use the dock facility.

If you will recall, in fuel cell repair we must have maximum safety. You will recall in my presentation I mentioned we have already preengineered a steel frame building. A firefighting system is piped into the building. We have explosionproof receptacles as well as an explosionproof flight. We feel this type of structure also is suitable for fuel cell repair.

We have this requirement generating now and we are looking into the possibility of attempting to use one of our docks with perhaps slight modification to handle the fuel cell problem.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What effect would the fuel cell repair facility have on the number of docks you supply from existing inventory? Would it decrease it?

Colonel STONE. Would the number of fuel cell docks requirements decrease the existing inventory?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel STONE. We have a program at the present time where we could move approximately 12 docks that we have already identified to facility for fuel cell repair. Our program is that we will have only one facility on a base designated for fuel cell repair. We have already identified 12.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would list for the record the docks and covered maintenance space available at SAC bases, showing the surplus or deficiency by bases.

(The information requested follows:)

SAC B–52/KC–135 maintenance docks

(1) Air Force base	(2) Maintenance spaces required	(3) Dock spaces existing	(4) Other spaces existing	(5) Total spaces existing	(6) Spaces deficient (col. 2 minus col. 5)	(7) Difference (col. 5 minus col. 2)		(8) Current utilization of difference
						Docks	Other	
Altus	7	8	4	12		2	3	Used for missiles.
Amarillo	7	4	0	4	3			
Barksdale	7	6	4	10		0	3	1 space used for base flight aircraft, 2 for C–124 aircraft.
Beale	[1] 8	4	0	4	4			
Bergstrom	7	4	2	6	1			
Biggs	4	10	4	14		6	4	
Blytheville	7	4	0	4	3			
Carswell	7	10	4	14		3	4	B–58 mission and training.
Castle	21	17	4	21	0	0	0	
Clinton Sherman	7	4	0	4	3			
Columbus	7	4	0	4	3			
Dow	4	4	0	4	0	0	0	
Eglin	5	3	0	3	2			
Ellsworth	9	8	17	25		0	16	2 spaces used for missiles, 14 for aircraft cover.
Fairchild	9	4	14	18		0	9	Aircraft cover.
Glasgow	7	4	0	4	3			
Grand Forks	7	4	0	4	3			
Griffiss	8	5	2	7	1			
Homestead	4	2	4	6		0	2	1 space for base flight aircraft; 1 space for GAM maintenance.
K. I. Sawyer	8	5	0	5	3			
Kincheloe	7	4	0	4	3			
Larson	9	0	17	17		0	8	1 space used for missiles; 10 of 17 total existing are in Boeing factory building on other side of base.
Loring	13	8	26	34		0	21	Aircraft cover.
March	9	2	4	6	3			
Mather	7	4	0	4	3			
Minot	7	4	0	4	3			
Ramey	7	7	0	7	0	0	0	
Robins	7	4	0	4	3			
Seymour Johnson	7	2	2	4	3			
Sheppard	7	4	0	4	3			
Travis	7	8	3	11		1	3	Hanger spaces used by MATS for base and transient maintenance.
Turner	7	4	0	4	3			
Walker	13	9	4	13	0	0	0	
Westover	13	0	19	19		0	6	Aircraft cover.
Wright-Patterson	7	4	0	4	3			
Wurtsmith	7	4	0	4	3			

[1] This figure includes 1 dock for base flight and transient maintenance.

COST ESTIMATES FOR MAINTENANCE DOCKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the date of your current cost estimates for the maintenance docks? Has this been revised since March 30, 1960, for example, or does it go prior to that date?

Colonel EDMONDS. I will have to check the last date. I do not have the last revision date available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you supply it for the record?

Colonel EDMONDS. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Following is a tabulation showing the dates of the original cost estimate, the amount included in the appropriation request, and the current cost estimate where available for all maintenance docks.

[Dollars in thousands]

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Base	Scope	Original estimate		Appropriation request	Current estimate	
		Date	Amount		Date	Amount
Grand Forks	2 each	December 1959	$1,073	$1,073		
K. I. Sawyer	do	do	866	866		
Kincheloe	do	do	993	993		
Minot	do	do	1,198	1,198		

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Robins	2 each	Jan. 9, 1959	$756	$650	Mar. 5, 1960	$650
Wright-Patterson	do	Dec. 22, 1959	1,123	700	Mar. 18, 1960	869

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Eglin	1 each	Mar. 5, 1960	$329	$386		

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Mather	2 each	Dec. 15, 1959	$1,067	$1,067	Mar. 15, 1960	$927

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Beale	3 each	Dec. 15, 1959	$1,068	$1,200	Mar. 15, 1960	$1,200
Blytheville	2 each	Dec. 14, 1959	984	491	Mar. 6, 1960	845
Clinton Sherman	do	Dec. 21, 1959	1,060	909		
Columbus	do	Mar. 5, 1959	842	908		
Glasgow	do	Dec. 15, 1959	1,100	1,100	Mar. 24, 1960	1,027
March	do	December 1959	735	1,000		
Turner	do	Jan. 11, 1960	844	844	Mar. 5, 1960	368
Wurtsmith	do	December 1959	977	977		

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Seymour Johnson	2 each	Jan. 8, 1960	$650	$700	Mar. 5, 1960	$685

NOTE.—All amounts above in thousands of dollars. As indicated above, none of the estimates are dated later than Mar. 30, 1960.

AIRCRAFT WASH RACKS AND CORROSION CONTROL FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the difference between the aircraft wash racks and the so-called corrosion-control facilities you are requesting?

Colonel STONE. If you look at some of the old wash racks they were

just a designated space on the ramp and we had a portable water supply. We had just cold water and a steam jenny in an attempt to get dirt and grease off an airplane, and there was no action on corrosion.

We have now found with high-speed aircraft, corrosion becomes a very important problem.

We now find electronic equipment is a problem. We were not so sensitive before; as a simple example we did not have near the number of cannon plugs before.

CALIBRATION AND INERTIAL GUIDANCE FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What study has been made of combining your stated requirement for a calibration system and testing facilities for an inertial guidance equipment with the Navy?

Colonel STONE. I would have to investigate that and supply the answer, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The Air Force has maintained close liaison with both the Army and the Navy on calibration requirements and on inertial-guidance system maintenance requirements. The Office of the Director of Defense, Research and Engineering, has thoroughly reviewed the respective requirements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and considers the two Air Force facilities at Heath and the Navy facility at the Naval Air Development Center at Johnsville to be firm requirements in their respective fields of support.

The Army facility requirements for their IRBM systems are not as stringent as are the Air Force requirements generated by the more precise guidance of ICBM and space systems.

The Navy facility, at Johnsville will be concerned with inertial guidance research, evaluation, and environmental testing. In the Air Force, such work is assigned to the Research and Development Command and is accomplished at Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex. The Navy facility is not tied in any way to any repair program, calibration program or quality control testing program of production items once the inertial-guidance systems have advanced from R. & D. to the production phase. It is these latter operational tasks which the Health Inertial Guidance Maintenance Facility will accomplish.

The tasks to be accomplished in the Heath AF standards calibration facility are quite different from those to be accomplished in the inertial guidance maintenance facility. Just as the National Bureau of Standards has a standard yard, a standard pound, and many other standard units of physical and electronic measurements for the Nation, so also must the Air Force have standards of known accuracy traceable from the National Bureau of Standards right down to the test equipment in the hands of the missile, aircraft, or electronics technician. Today, routine measurements by line technicians are of an accuracy which a few years ago were attainable only in laboratories. The volume of calibration work at each level is known and the facilities and the system are being established to meet that work level with each level supporting the one below it. The Bureau of Standards concurs in the Air Force approach to its calibration problem and has been most helpful in developing the system, particularly with respect to Heath. The Bureau fully recognizes the necessity for the precise measurements the Air Force must make in the missile age and is cooperating in the solution of our more complex problems. It is not considered practical physically, geographically, or organizationally to integrate calibration requirements of the other services into the Air Force system. On a case-by-case basis, the Air Force will provide calibration service to other Government agencies to the extent of its capability. For example, certain Navy Pacific Missile Range calibration requirements are now supported by the Air Force at Vandenberg Air Force Base, as are certain Army requirements in Europe and the Far East.

There is a distinct advantage to the Air Force in putting the two planned facilities together at Heath. It is expected that about 15 percent of the workload of the Heath calibration facility will be in direct support of the inertial guidance maintenance facility. The extreme seismic stability of the Heath

calibration facility is absolutely essential in the evaluation of inertial guidance accelerometers and gyros.

In summary, there is a fundamental difference between the three facilities mentioned above. The calibration facility at Heath will provide calibration services much beyond the calibration scope of either the Johnsville facility or the inertial maintenance facility at Heath. The inertial maintenance facility at Heath will support the operational equipment sent in from the field for overhaul. The Johnsville facility will support research and development activities. The projected workload for these three facilities indicates that all will be utilized to full capacity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you also would list for the record your specific requests for these facilities.

(The information referred to follows:)

Installation	Scope	Amount
Precision measurement equipment laboratories:	*Square feet*	*Thousands*
Duluth	1,650	$47
Grand Forks	1,650	49
K. I. Sawyer	1,650	40
Kingsley	1,650	48
Kincheloe	1,650	40
Minot	1,650	61
Otis	1,650	40
Paine	1,650	40
Richard Gebaur	1,650	40
Tyndall	1 650	40
Glasgow	1,650	65
Incirlik	1,400	32
Standards calibration laboratory (depot):		
McClellan	10,000	469
Robins (Mod)	10,000	261
Air Force standards calibration facility: Heath maintenance annex	25,522	1,000

MOBILE TESTING FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. You explained to the committee a series of mobile facilities for testing and what not.

Colonel STONE. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are these of special design?

Colonel STONE. This power equipment is applicable to more than one aircraft. As an example, you saw the MA–2 multipurpose starting. That is applicable to the F–100 and F–101. It can also be used on other series of aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would assume if the entire program becomes funded there will be a considerable number of those vehicles?

Colonel STONE. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total number?

Colonel STONE. Taking F–100's as an example, 25 units per wing is the basis. I will guess we are talking 2,000 or 3,000 units.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it your intention on those that you have to have designed to first have the design created and then put them under competitive bid for procurement purposes?

Colonel STONE. I would have to check this with our procurement people and I will check it and submit the information for the record.

General MINTON. All of these are already under design.

Colonel STONE. These are already designed. They have all been procured and some are on second procurement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Once you have the design for a vehicle of this character is there any reason to assume there cannot be a competitive procurement once you have a final design?

Colonel STONE. To my knowledge there is not. I would like to check with the procurement people.

(The information requested is as follows:)

Yes. Very much so. Contracts for such equipment are among the largest fixed-price, competitively advertised procurements awarded by the Air Force each year.

INACTIVATION OF FACILITIES

Mr. WHITTEN. In this overall presentation how close is the tie in between your unit and that of the Air Force which has made determinations as to what airbases to retain? How much of this might be at a base where the base would be moved before you got all this construction completed?

General MINTON. We are having our air defense presentation on a new look tomorrow with the Norad and Air Defense Command people. We expect to have that staffed by the first of May.

I expect there will be some changes, not very many, and before any of these are put under contract we will be as certain as we possibly can be that the need for these facilities will continue. We will go slow in putting this under contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. Speaking generally now, but by and large once you start with this completed program how much time from the time you make your decision do you contemplate will lapse before you have completed?

General MINTON. It will depend on where the bases are—north, south—and the time we get allocation of money from the Bureau of the Budget.

If the base is down south I would say the facilities would be in existence and in use by the first of September of next year. If they are up north where we cannot get full advantage of the construction season it will be the latter part.

Mr. WHITTEN. And you say this is tied in directly with the planning side of the Air Force so you will not be caught with a lot of expenditures for places you will be abandoning?

General MINTON. Yes, sir. The military construction panel does almost a daily review of these problems. Before we award any contract throughout the world it must be cleared at our headquarters, and before we clear it we check with the operations people to be sure there is no suspected change.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know you do the best you can but the records show a number of places where expenditures have been made and then the facility left vacant. In spite of your efforts the record shows in times past you have not always been too successful in this area.

I would like to personally stress we can improve somewhat in that area over past performance.

General MINTON. We have made some mistakes in the past and built things we should not have built. Dollarwise some have been expensive.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not saying it is your fault. I do not refer to you as a group. I know you do the best you can. The Secretary of Defense should know now that if base X does not figure into the plans next year, and if he did not tell you, it would leave you out on a limb despite the fact you are doing the best you can.

I want to know how closely your plans are current with the man who makes those decisions and how much they have projected future use in their directions to you so that you know how to plan.

General MINTON. As a general rule the Department of Defense takes our recommendations on the bases.

I think, Mr. Whitten, we know sooner than he because I think we are in a better position to evaluate the movement of the air defense units back and forth.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

I did not mean to direct this to you General, but the overall problem gets so big the left hand does not always know what the right hand is contemplating.

PLANNING

Mr. SHEPPARD. Turning now to planning, please place page 20 of the justifications in the record at this point.

(The page follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION PLANNING
DIR TO TOWN
COUNTY, STATE
COUNTRY
COMMAND

PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES
TOTAL ACRES

DATE OCC

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
				40,000	

77

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
PLANNING	1		155					LS	40,000

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have a summary statement on this situation?

Colonel EDMONDS. I have a statement here I would like to insert in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

ADVANCE PLANNING

The request for advance planning funds in this program is primarily for planning the fiscal year 1962 military construction program plus completion of the remaining items left in the fiscal year 1961 MCP. As the chairman may recall, we reprogramed $22 million in January 1960 and at that time indicated that we were still about $15 million deficient to complete the fiscal year 1961 and prior programs.

We also said at that time that we may have to come back to the committee and reprogram for this deficiency prior to the end of the fiscal year. We have been particularly conservative with planning funds since January and estimate that we have reduced our deficiency to about $10 million. We are trying to get by through the end of this fiscal year without an additional reprograming request. We, therefore, plan to cover this $10 million required to finish up the fiscal year 1961 and prior program out of the $40 million new funds requested in this program before you today, leaving $30 million to plan the fiscal year 1962 MCP.

As you are well aware, we do not know at this time exactly what the fiscal year 1962 MCP will be. It is, therefore, necessary to make an estimate of the magnitude of the fiscal year 1962 program. We have used a figure of $800 million for this purpose.

We estimate that of the $800 million, about $400 million will be for ballistic missiles, satellites, research and development, and other technical-type facilities which require between 5 and 6 percent for design. Planning funds for this portion of the program would then amount to about $22 to $24 million. Other common-type line items to be planned would total about $360 million. Planning on this type item costs about 3½ to 4 percent and this would generate a planning fund requirement for between $12.6 million and $14.4 million. Not included in the above figures is a requirement for extensive field investigation surveys, soils data, water exploratory operations, etc., for the new ICBM sites, particularly MINUTEMAN, which amounts to between $9 and $10 million.

The above requirements total between $53.6 and $58.4 million against which we are requesting only $40 million at this time.

OBLIGATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much money have you obligated for planning in fiscal year 1960 and what do you estimate your total obligations in this respect will be?

Mr. SUFIT. We will supply that for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Obligations

1960 (actual through March 1960)	$37,004,000
Estimated through June 1960	55,000,000

ESTIMATED STATUS OF FINAL PLANS AND SPECIFICATION FOR 1962 PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. What percentage of your 1962 program will be brought to final plans and specifications with this amount of money?

Colonel EDMONDS. In our request of the $40 million, Mr. Chairman, we think that amount will take us through most all of the 1962 year

but we do not know at this time what the exact magnitude of the 1962 program will be.

Based on our estimates we think we might need about $13 million more, but with the best accurate estimates we can make on what the magnitude of the program will be, we think we will be able to complete 1962 substantially.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean by that you will have final plans and specifications? Is that what you actually mean?

Colonel EDMONDS. I would not say we would have 100 percent final plans and specifications on every 1962 item before we come to this committee next year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is assumed from past presentations that there is a certain percentage you can finalize within a given period of time. Then there is another percentage which has to do with preliminary plans and estimates. One follows up the other.

What is your thinking on this?

General MINTON. I have actually put them in three categories. I would put first the category of the missile and new weapons system. We do not want to get final and complete designs too early in the game on the new weapons. We want to get everything up to date before we advertise. We want to have a design at the stage that can be modified to reflect these changes so we can award contracts as quickly as possible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With that requirement technique is it not obvious you will be later?

General MINTON. That is right. We want to make it as late before the scheduled date as we can but we want to meet the scheduled date.

However, in the case of these items, and we are doing more and more of it, of site adapting approved designs, we will have these complete. The only problem we will have is site adaptability.

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Continuing, we shall take up now the construction program in the continental United States and insert page 23 of the justifications.

(The page follows:)

Command:	*Appropriation request (thousands)*
Alaskan Air Command	$14,891
Air Defense Command	28,204
Air Materiel Command	22,878
Air Research and Development	24,037
Air Training Command	28,961
Air University	7,275
Headquarters Command	3,446
Military Air Transport Service	5,249
Pacific Air Force	265
Strategic Air Command	68,736
Tactical Air Command	8,290
A.C. & W	34,751
AFTAC-ZI	684
Various worldwide	297,600
Total	545,267

Alaskan Air Command

Mr. Sheppard. We shall pick up the first command, the Alaskan Air Command, and insert the appropriate pages of the justification to cover this area.

(The justifications follow:)

Various Facilities—A.C. & W.

Included in the program for the Alaskan Air Command are various types of facilities in the amount of $5,414,000 required in support of the following A.C. & W. sites:

Bethel Air Force Station
Kotzebue Air Force Station
Northeast Cape Air Force Station
Sparrevohn Air Force Station
Unalakleet Air Force Station

The facilities needed at these sites to support their operational mission consisting generally of radar towers and power modification work, water supply and an additional dormitory at one station.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	BETHEL AFS	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI W BETHEL	GOVT OWNED	1,482
COUNTY, STATE	4th JUDICIAL DIV,	OTHER ACRES	29
COUNTRY	ALASKA	TOTAL ACRES	1,511
COMMAND	AAC		
		DATE OCC	1955
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AC&W SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
9		89		97		28

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
8,800	6,104	174	2,522	1,187	1,335

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TOWER RADAR FPS-20		294		NEW	3	2	1	1	EA	263
TOWER RADAR FPS-6		295		NEW	3	2	1	1	EA	224
ELE PRIMARY POWER	MOD	296		NEW	1,800		1,800	1,800	KW	700
										1,187

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Tower radar FPS–20	District engineer	$10.0	0
Tower radar FPS–6	do	8.5	0
Ele primary power	do	20.8	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	EIELSON AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	19 MI NW FAIRBANKS	GOVT OWNED	33,449
COUNTY, STATE	4th JUDICIAL DIV, ALASKA	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	33,449
COMMAND	AAC	DATE OCC	1944
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ VARIOUS SAC MISSIONS WEATHER RECON SQ (MTO)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
357		4235		4592		376

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
181,000	162,473	9,490	9,037	5,496	3,541

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TAXIWAY ALERT	I		NEW	10,000		10,000	10,000	SY	250
BARRIER A/C RUNWAY	RELC 7		NEW	2		2	2	EA	110
LIGHTING APPROACH	DFRP 440		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	515
LIGHTING R/W HI	DFRP 63		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	548
HANGAR ALERT	RELC I		NEW	41,329		41,329	41,329	SF	1,600
FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRN	MOD 8		NEW	8,200	1,872	6,328	4,700	SF	35
TEST CELL JET	11		NEW	1		1	1	EA	200
SHOP MISSILE ASSEMBL	I		NEW	3,940		3,940	3,940	SF	320
STOR. BASE M/CUB MAG	I		NEW	16,965		16,965	16,965	SF	1,350
CHAPEL ANNEX	264		149	3,800		3,800	3,800	SF	227
OPEN MESS OFFICER	RPMT 265		NEW	10,000		10,000	6,000	SF	341
									5,496

EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE

Eielson Air Force Base is located 19 miles southeast of Fairbanks, Alaska. The mission for this base is for the Fighter Interceptor and Strategic Air Command missions. The program requested for Eielson totals $5,496,000 and includes 11 items:

The first item is for a taxiway alert needed to support deployment of the fighter interceptor type aircraft to this base. There is no existing alert taxiway. Failure to provide the facility will result in the inability of the fighter squadron to "scramble" within the 5-minute time limitation required.

The second item will provide construction of runway barriers at each end of the primary runway. Barriers are necessary for the protection of air crews and extremely expensive type aircraft under emergency landing conditions. There are no facilities currently installed at this base to meet this critical operational requirement.

The third item is for approach lighting and is needed to replace obsolete substandard lights at the instrument approach end of the primary runway. The lighting will be of the latest type equipment conforming to current Air Force criteria and international agreements. Fighter-interceptor aircraft operating from this base, require these lights. The completion of these lights will satisfy total base requirements.

The fourth item, high intensity lighting, is to be placed along the southeast end of the primary runway. The project includes the removal of the presently installed low intensity lighting system. This project is required for the operation of the high speed jet type fighter aircraft assigned to this base.

The fifth item is for the relocation of an alert hangar. This is required for minimum operation of the fighter interceptor aircraft and will provide one four-bay alert hangar and one four-bay aircraft shelter. Considerable savings to the Air Force will be made by relocating the present excess hangar presently located at Ladd AFB, some 28 miles distant to Eielson AFB.

The sixth item requested is for the modification of an existing building to provide approximately 4,700 square foot of space for a fighter interceptor flight simulator, classrooms and maintenance facility. The project is needed to support the scheduled deployment of fighter aircraft to this base. It is required to bring pilot training to a high degree of effectiveness, during the preliminary phases of training. This facility when constructed, will satisfy 80 percent of the total requirement.

The seventh item for a jet test cell, is required so that tests can be performed on jet engines for fighter type aircraft prior to their installation in the aircraft. These tests are mandatory before an overhaul or replacement engine can be installed. There is no facility available that can be utilized for this purpose.

The eighth item requested is a missile assembly shop. This is required to test, checkout, assemble and maintain nuclear missiles for fighter interceptor aircraft. No similar type structure is available to the fighter interceptor squadron for this purpose.

The ninth item is multicubical storage base magazine to provide an operational capability for employment of air defense armament, in keeping with the approved satellite alert concept. It will meet the total requirement for this type of facility at this installation.

The 10th item is for an annex to the existing base chapel to provide religious and moral education requirements for personnel at this base.

The 11th item is needed to replace an existing unusable officers' open mess. This structure is beyond economical repair and is badly deteriorated. Its construction will satisfy 60 percent of the total requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Taxiway alert	District engineer	$27.9	0
Barrier A/C runway	do	2.8	0
Lighting approach	do	12.7	0
Lighting R/W HI	do	7.3	0
Hangar alert	do	42.0	0
Flight simulator trn	do	1.6	0
Test cell jet	do	3.5	0
Shop missile assembl	do	16.2	0
Stor. base M/cub mag	do	38.7	0
Chapel annex	do	25.0	95
Open mess officer	do	12.9	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	ELMENDORF AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI SE ANCHORAGE	GOVT OWNED	13,192
COUNTY, STATE	4th JUDICIAL DIV,	OTHER ACRES	8
COUNTRY	ALASKA	TOTAL ACRES	13,200
COMMAND	AAC	DATE OCC	1940
PRINCIPAL MISSION	HQ ALASKAN AIR CMD HQ AIR DIV DEF VARIOUS SAC MISSIONS USAF HOSPITAL SUPPORT GROUP		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1981	209	8053	687	10930		1445

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
229,000	219,353	4,604	5,043	314	4,729

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING, T/W	441		149	65,068	38,440	26,628	4,000	FT	99
UTILITIES, SUNFLOWER	266		149	A/R		LS		LS	215
									314

Elmendorf Air Force Base

Elmendorf Air Force Base is located 2 miles northwest of Anchorage, Alaska. The mission for this base is for the Alaskan Air Command headquarters, Air Defense Division headquarters and various SAC missions. The program requested for Elmendorf totals $314,000 and includes the following:

The first item for 4,000 feet of taxiway lighting on the north-south parallel taxiway to permit efficient and safe circulation of aircraft during the long periods of darkness in the winter months.

The second item provides for the first increment of utilities for permanent streets and sidewalks for the 100 duplex unit family housing area constructed in 1946.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Lighting, T/W	District engineer	$22.0	100
Utilities, sunflower	do	6.5	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	GALENA APT	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI SE GALENA	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	4th JUDICIAL DIV, ALASKA	OTHER ACRES	5,264
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,264
COMMAND	AAC	DATE OCC	1943
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ROT) AACS SQ (MTO) WEATHER SQ (MTO)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
7		208		215		15

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
9,800	6,677	615	2,508	1,965	543

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY,PRIMARY,INST EXTD	I		NEW	150,000	120,834	29,166	16,667	SY	1,965
									1,965

GALENA AIRPORT

The next base to be considered is Galena Airport, Galena, Alaska. The planned mission of this base is for rotational fighter interceptor squadrons, weather squadrons for MATS, and includes an item for extension of the present primary runway by 1,000 feet on the eastern end at a cost of $1,965,000. This extension is required in order to operate jet type fighter interceptor aircraft at this forward operational base. Without this item the present deployment plan for fighter interceptor aircraft at this forward base cannot be put into effect.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Runway, primary, inst. extd	District engineer	$78.7	25

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	KING SALMON APT	GOVT LEASED	14
DIR TO TOWN	15 MI W NAKNEK	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	3rd JUDICIAL DIV,	OTHER ACRES	4,558
COUNTRY	ALASKA	TOTAL ACRES	4,572
COMMAND	AAC	DATE OCC	1950
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AC&W SQ FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ROT)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
19		337		356		7

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
18,500	14,959	1,270	2,271	973	1,298

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY PRIM/INSTRUMT	EXTD I		NEW	141,667	125,000	16,667	16,667	SY	973
									973

KING SALMON AIRPORT

King Salmon Airport, located 15 miles east of Naknek, Alaska, includes an item for 16,667 square yards of primary runway extension of 1,000 feet at a cost of $973,000. This extension, like the one for Galena Airport, is required in order to operate jet type fighter interceptor aircraft at this forward operational base. Failure to provide this item will prevent the planned use of this type aircraft in this forward area.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Runway prin/instrumt extd	District engineer	$37.1	25

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	KOTZEBUE AFS	GOVT LEASED		OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI W KOTZEBUE	GOVT OWNED	1,115	BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
COUNTY, STATE	2nd JUDICIAL DIV, ALASKA	OTHER ACRES		11		94		105		5
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,115							
COMMAND	AAC	DATE OCC		EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)	
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AC&W SQ AACS SQ			5,800	4,704	-0-	1,096	633	463	

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TOWER RADAR FPS-20	289		NEW	4	2	2	1	EA	217
TOWER RADAR FPS-6	290		NEW	4	2	2	1	EA	416
									633

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Tower radar FPS–20	District engineer	$8.3	0
Tower radar FPS–6	do	15.9	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	LADD AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI W FAIRBANKS	GOVT OWNED	13,849
COUNTY, STATE	4th JUDICIAL DIV, ALASKA	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	13,849
COMMAND		DATE OCC	1937
PRINCIPAL MISSION	USAF HOSPITAL AIR MED LABORATORY WEATHER RECON SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
405		2805		3210		752

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
224,901	220,383	3,789	729	729	-0-

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
OPEN MESS NCO	603		NEW	10,000		10,000	10,000	SF	729
									729

Ladd Air Force Base

The next location in the Alaskan Air Command to be considered is Ladd Air Force Base. This installation is located 1 mile east of Fairbanks. The planned Air Force mission of this base is for a hospital, air medical laboratory and a weather reconnaissance squadron. Army missions for this base are not listed, but Army personnel strength at this base is anticipated in excess of 2,425 personnel. The request for this base is for $729,000 to construct an NCO open mess of 10,000 square feet. It is required for both Air Force and Army noncommissioned officers assigned to the base. The open mess, operating at cost, fulfills a major recreational need without undue expense, thus greatly improving the morale and welfare of noncommissioned officers and their dependents in this northern isolated area. At present, the NCO open mess is housed in a temporary log structure, which is makeshift for this puprose.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Open mess NCO	Unknown	$21.9	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	NORTHEAST CAPE AFS	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI SE KULOWIYI	GOVT OWNED	4,800
COUNTY, STATE	2nd JUDICIAL DIV, ALASKA	OTHER ACRES	74
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,874
COMMAND	AACS	DATE OCC	1952
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AC&W SQ WEATHER SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAP
8		271		279		5

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
10,200	6,502	1,733	1,965	1,367	598

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
DORMITORY AIRMEN	ADDN	I		NEW	276	196	80	80	MN	597
ELE PRIMARY POWER	MOD	I		NEW	2,000		2,000	2,000	KW	770
										1,367

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Dormitory, airmen	District engineer	$22.8	0
Ele primary power	do	28.8	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION: SPARREVOHN WHITE ALICE
DIR TO TOWN: 60 MI ESE STONY RIVER
COUNTY, STATE: 4TH JUDICIAL DIV ALASKA
COUNTRY
COMMAND: AAC
PRINCIPAL MISSION: AC&W SQ WHITE ALICE

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED 1,058
OTHER ACRES
TOTAL ACRES 1,058
DATE OCC

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
12		137		149		3

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
7,500	3,747	1,776	1,977	1,512	465

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TOWER RADAR FPS-6		291		NEW	3	2	1	1	EA	298
ELE PRIMARY POWER	MOD	297		NEW	2,000		2,000	2,000	KW	770
WATER SUPPLY-W.ALICE		622		149	A/R		LS		LS	444
										1,512

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Tower radar FPS–6	District engineer	$11.4	0
Ele primary power	do	43.9	0
Water supply—W. Alice	do	16.9	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	UNALAKLEET AFS	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI SQ UNALAKLEET	GOVT OWNED	623
COUNTY, STATE	2nd JUDICIAL DIV,	OTHER ACRES	31
COUNTRY	ALASKA	TOTAL ACRES	654
COMMAND	AAC		
		DATE OCC	1954
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AC&W SQ AACS (TACAN) (MTO)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
11		97		108		4

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
4,555	3,840	-0-	715	715	-0-

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TOWER RADAR FPS-20	292		NEW	4	2	2	1	EA	239
TOWER RADAR FPS-6	293		NEW	4	2	2	1	EA	476
									715

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Tower radar FPS-6	District engineer	$18.2	0
Tower radar FPS-20	do	9.1	0

Colonel PARKHILL. We have a program of projects on 10 bases totaling $14,891,000. The special and high cost projects total $10,990,000.

I will summarize these. First is Galena Airport, runway extension, $1,965,000.

Next is King Salmon Airport runway extension, $973,000.

Ladd Air Force Base open mess, NCO, $729,000.

Four ACW sites, radar towers.

For three ACW sites, electric power additions.

For Eielson, alert hangar, and also a storage multicubicle magazine.

Other projects are airfield pavements and lighting on three cases, training and maintenance facilities at Eielson, airmen dormitory for one ACW site, and religious and community facilities for Eielson, and utilities on two bases.

EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. With reference to Eielson Air Force Base, when was the decision made to put fighter interceptor aircraft at this base and what was the reason for this decision, if you know?

Colonel LILES. Quite late in the year we decided we would like to put the 101 into Eielson. The reason was to reduce the airfield operation at Ladd if possible.

The runway at Ladd was rather short. Eielson had a splendid runway which we could use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for an Officers Club here at the present time?

General MINTON. At Eielson?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel PARKHILL. There is an old temporary building whose subflooring and substructure is rotting. It is considered a fire trap, a hazard, and we will demolish it when we get the new club.

GALENA AIRPORT

Mr. SHEPPARD. How often do fighter interceptor squadrons utilize this airport?

Colonel LILES. We have four F101–B aircraft there at all times. That is our program. This new type of fighter interceptor will require a 1,000-foot extension to the existing runway.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long have you been using the present runway there?

Colonel PARKHILL. Date of occupancy is 1943. The existing runway was all right for the older type aircraft but it is not sufficiently long for the new interceptors.

SPARREVOHN WHITE ALICE

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for water supply at White Alice?

Colonel PARKHILL. Here at White Alice they are presently hauling water in a tank with a 1,200-gallon capacity. The existing 3,000-gallon tank provides only a 2½-day supply for the men at the base.

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall take up now the Air Materiel Command and insert page 198 in the record.

(The page follows:)

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation	Command	Appropriation request
Gentile AFS	AMC	422
Griffiss AFB	AMC	1,725
Heath Maintenance Annex (G)	AMC	3,907
Hill AFB	AMC	4,095
Kelly AFB	AMC	769
McClellan AFB	AMC	1,470
Norton AFB	AMC	169
Robins AFB	AMC	1,478
Stockbridge Test Annex	AMC	2,653
Tinker AFB	AMC	1,865
Wright-Patterson AFB	AMC	4,325
Total		22,878

NOTE.—Revised Apr. 11, 1960.

GENTILE AIR FORCE STATION, OHIO

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the first project, Gentile Air Force Station.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:GENTILE AFS	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:DAYTON	GOVT OWNED	: 164
COUNTY, STATE	:MONTGOMERY OHIO	OTHER ACRES	: 1
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 165
COMMAND	:AMC		
		DATE OCC	:1944
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:MAINT & SUPPLY DEPOT		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
35		13		48		4,591

EST TOTAL COST ($M)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 ($M)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($M)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($M)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($M)	FUTURE YEARS ($M)
20,000	14,453		5,547	422	5,125

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($M)
COM LOG NET FACILITY	MOD	I	NEW	10,000		10,000	10,000	SF	422
									422

GENTILE AIR FORCE STATION

Gentile Air Force Station is located at Dayton, Ohio. The planned use of this station is for a maintenance and supply depot. The total program requested amounts to $422,000 and involves one item for a combat logistical network (COMLOGNET) facility. This item provides for modification of an existing warehouse type building to house the Gentile COMLOGNET switching and relay station. The COMLOGNET is a consolidation of numerous existing communication networks. It has been established to support the use of high speed automatic data processing equipment throughout the Air Force, to effect savings and improvements in the management and conduct of weapon support activities.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Combat logistical network facility modification.	Unknown	21,000	0

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert a statement showing the location of the other centers in your so-called combat logistic network.

(The information requested follows:)

The following is a list of automatic switching centers as approved by the Office of the Secretary of Defense that currently make up the Air Force combat logistics network (COMLOGNET):

1. Norton AFB, Calif.
2. McClellan AFB, Calif.
3. Tinker AFB, Okla.
4. Andrews AFB, Md.
5. Gentile AFB, Ohio

Space for centers 1 and 2 is being provided through modification of existing facilities. Space for the other three is included in this program. Prior to OSD approving the COMLOGNET all service requirements were screened and one of the specifications of the network was to insure its compatability with all services. In future programs it is anticipated that OSD approval will be sought to add six more switching centers to complete the network. The centers are to be located at:

Hill AFB, Utah
Griffiss AFB, N.Y.
Kelly AFB, Tex.
Brookley AFB, Ala.
Olmsted AFB, Pa.
Robins AFB, Ga.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What steps have you taken to coordinate this activity with those of other services and the Department of Defense?

Colonel PARKHILL. This network is being developed by the Air Force and is in accordance with plans of the Department of Defense. It is a coordinated development, and each element of our program here is approved by the Department of Defense and is an integrated part of the whole system.

GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:GRIFFISS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI NW ROME	GOVT OWNED	:3,469
COUNTY, STATE	:ONEIDA NEW YORK	OTHER ACRES	: 641
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:4,110
COMMAND	:AMC	DATE OCC	: 1942

PRINCIPAL MISSION :HQ ROME AMA
ROME AF DEPOT
ROME AIR DEV CNTR HQ (ARDC)
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)
HVY BOMB SQ (SAC)
AIR REF SQ (SAC)
HQ GEEIA

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
770	80	2,491	80	3,421		7,891

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
131,000	70,670	52,457	7,873	1,725	6,148

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING, APPROACH	ADDN	126		NEW	3,000	1,500	1,500	1,475	FT	153
LIGHTING, R/W NGCL		127		NEW	A/R		LS		LS	350
FIRE STATION, LINE		28	SAC	NEW	26,972	10,472	16,500	5,687	SF	235
OPER. MISSION TNG	ADDN	I	SAC	NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	60
SHOP ARM & ELEC.	ADDN	350	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	127
HEADQUARTERS WING		35	SAC	NEW	10,050		10,050	10,050	SF	250
LOGISTICAL FAC DEPOT	MOD	133		NEW	508,012	269,715	238,297	91,000	SF	550
										1,725

GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE

Griffiss Air Force Base is located approximately 1 mile southeast of Rome, N.Y. The planned use of Griffiss AFB is for the Headquarters, Rome Air Materiel Area, Rome Air Force Depot, the Rome Air Development Center Headquarters, an Air Defense Command fighter mission and a Strategic Air Command bomber mission. The total program requested amounts to $1,725,000.

The first two items are required to provide an adequate and standard approach lighting system for the newly constructed runway. The lights are necessary to effectively and safely handle the heavy air traffic associated with this depot, SAC and ADC operational missions.

Four items requested are in support of the Strategic Air Command bomber mission. The existing crash station of 8 stalls is located in a hangar building (building No. 100) adjacent to the flight line. This facility is located approximately 1.3 miles from the B–52 and KC–135 alert and maintenance areas, which makes it impossible for crash and rescue and firefighting operations to be effective and efficient. The existing crash house is fully utilized and no space exists for housing the additional equipment required to support the SAC mission. Without this facility the fire equipment will be required to remain outside in the SAC area. The severe cold winters in this region would make it necessary that the engine be kept running continually at that time of the year to insure that the equipment be operational when needed.

An addition to the existing Target Intelligence Building will provide space for simulators for training SAC combat crews. Additional armament and electronic shop space is required to handle the increased workload. A new headquarters building is needed to house the SAC wing functions of administration, maintenance, supply, operational planning and aircraft control activities.

The last item will provide administration space for approximately 690 personnel assigned to the Headquarters, Ground Electronics Engineering Installation Agency.

In addition, authorization is being requested for the construction of 135 units of family housing with private capital under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting, approach addition	St. John, Platt & Carlson	$7.6	57
Lighting, runway NGCL	do	17.5	30
Fire station, line	Kirmmse, Eckerland & Wilson	11.7	57
Operations mission training addition	do	3.0	57
Shop armament and electronic addition.	do	6.3	0
Headquarters wing	do	12.5	0
Logistical facility depot modification	Anaconda-Jurden Associates	27.5	60

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no questions on these items.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have no questions.

HEATH MAINTENANCE ANNEX, OHIO

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, we have the Heath Maintenance Annex, Ohio.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:HEATH MAINT ANNEX	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:NEWARK	GOVT OWNED :	38
COUNTY, STATE	:LICKING OHIO	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES:	38
COMMAND	:AMC		
		DATE OCC :	PROGRAMMED
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:CALIBRATION, MAINT & TESTING		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
(Inlcuded in Gentile AFS)						

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
12,000	6,298		5,702	3,907	1,795

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
INERTIAL GUID.MAINT.	I		NEW	88,480		88,480	88,480	SF	2,907
AF STANDARDS CAL FAC	I		NEW	25,522		25,522	25,522	SF	1,000
									3,907

HEATH MAINTENANCE ANNEX

Heath Maintenance Annex, located at Heath, Ohio. Planned use of this annex is in support of Gentile Air Force Station. The total program requested is $3,907,000 and involves two related items. Both items will involve modification of an existing facility that was originally constructed by the Air Force for aircraft fusilage fabrication. The building is 425 feet by 905 feet. Inside the building are massive concrete pits which were made to receive heavy presses. The presses were never installed due to curtailment of that program.

The first item provides for modification of 88,480 square feet of space required for the repair of the inertial guidance systems associated with the ATLAS, TITAN, MINUTEMAN, and HOUND DOG weapon systems.

The other project provides for modification within the pit area to provide a facility for standards calibration and inspection and test of precision equipment in the fields of electrical-electronic, electromechanical, and dimensional measurements. This location was selected for this activity because the existing massive concrete pit, coupled with the inherent seismic stability of the Heath area, provide an essentially vibrationless condition unavailable at any other known Government facility.

Design construction

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Inertial guidance maintenance	Unknown	$145.5	60
AF standards calibration facility	American Machine & Foundry	164.0	10

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for inertial guidance facilities in the Air Force at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is a new requirement that is coming up. As I understand it we have a limited activity at Wright-Patterson which is insufficient to take care of the new requirements generated by the ATLAS, TITAN, and HOUND DOG inertial guidance systems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does this compare with a similar facility being constructed by the Navy in Pennsylvania?

Colonel PARKHILL. We understand that project is either constructed or has been proposed by the Navy. Our understanding is that it will not duplicate this facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If this has not been checked out you had perhaps better check it out with the Navy in order to have your response coincide.

General MINTON. We will check that and insert something in the record with your permission.

(The information requested will be found on p. 73.)

Colonel URBACH. The latest memorandum we have will bear out Colonel Parkhill's statement. The facility in question at Johnsville, Pa., does not duplicate anything that the Air Force is requesting. The Johnsville facility for the Navy is in use. The facility the Air Force is requesting is not in that category.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the basic reason for the selection of this specific location?

Colonel URBACH. The selection of the facility at Heath, Ohio, was that for inertial guidance maintenance where certain seismic conditions are required. At this plant which we are recommending for this inertial guidance repair and the Heath calibration facility, we were able to go to the bottom of the pit and measure the seismic stability of that pit.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the circumstance was any consideration given to Holloman?

Colonel URBACH. Yes, sir. Seismic testings were taken in various locations in the United States, not only Holloman, but they did not qualify for this particular kind of function.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have had previous testimony pertaining to this. I wish you would give us a clear statement of the reasons for not using that location, predicated upon past statements.

Colonel URBACH. All right, sir. In addition to the use of the Heath facility, we were making use of an already existing facility that was actually a surplus industrial plant that we were putting into operation and not having to reconstruct a new item.

(The information requested follows:)

The Air Force chose the Heath location for the calibration facility for several important reasons:

(*a*) Extreme seismic stability is absolutely essential to the calibration of most Air Force measurement standards as well as accelerometers and gyros of inertial guidance systems. The existing deep pits at the Heath maintenance annex are known to meet this requirement. Detailed surveys have failed to reveal any other available Government-owned facility of the required seismic stability.

(*b*) Close temperature and humidity control is essential for the functioning of this facility. The deep underground pits now have very steady temperature and humidity conditions and accordingly the control problem is simplified and the conditions more readily attainable.

(*c*) The Heath facility is located at a reasonable distance from Gentile Air Force Station which is the designated AMC activity now managing the Air Force precision measurement program. By the fortunate coincidence of this fact, with those stated above, management can be simplified by utilizing Heath.

(*d*) The Heath plant is a facility in being and available not only for the calibration function, but also admirably suited for the inertial guidance maintenance facility. There is room for this latter function to expand if this should become necessary in the future. The calibration facility will provide some direct support to the maintenance operation, therefore, colocation is sound. Operating economics will result from this joint utilization of specialized skills and high cost equipment and work space.

(*e*) The cost of providing both facilities at Heath is substantially less than it would be to build new facilities from the ground up. Furthermore, the required stability of a new facility could not be guaranteed. Engineers state that a period of perhaps as long as 3 years would be required for new construction to settle. This would be totally unacceptable.

The Air Force looked at many locations before Heath was selected. Some locations met one or more of the criteria, but none had the seismic stability of Heath. This consideration is so overriding that all other considerations became of secondary significance. Consideration was given to Air Research and Development Command facilities such as Holloman Air Force Base where currently ARDC is conducting R. & D. dynamic testing of inertial guidance components. The seismic stability of the Holloman Air Force Base area is much better than the average of other areas checked but not as good as Heath. In addition, Holloman has no facility in being, so construction would have to begin from the ground up with the unacceptable disadvantages previously noted. This is a difficult area to recruit personnel of the needed qualifications as compared to Heath. These are typical of the considerations which ruled out other locations which were considered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item? (No response.)

HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Hill Air Force Base, Utah.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	HILL AFB	GOVT LEASED	16
DIR TO TOWN	4 MI W CLEARFIELD	GOVT OWNED	6,345
COUNTY, STATE	DAVIS UTAH	OTHER ACRES	5
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	6,366
COMMAND	AMC		
		DATE OCC	1940

PRINCIPAL MISSION
HQ OGDEN AMA
LOG SUP SQ
RADAR EVAL SQ ADC
AIR RES FLYING (CNC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	OAP
352	53	1,334	39	1,778		11,865

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
81,000	69,983	3,642	7,375	4,095	3,280

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TERMINAL AIR FREIGHT DFRP	128		REW	87,075		87,075	49,450	SF	1,195
MISSILE MAINT FAC	I		REW					LS	2,900
									4,095

Hill Air Force Base

Hill Air Force Base is located 4 miles east of Ogden, Utah. The planned use of Hill Air Force Base is for the Headquarters, Ogden Air Materiel Area, including depot support for MINUTEMAN and an Air Defense Command mission and a Reserve unit. Appropriation in the amount of $4,095,000 is requested to provide an airfreight terminal and the MINUTEMAN maintenance facilities.

The first item provides a complete airfreight terminal to replace the present inadequate uneconomical facility. Since construction of the original terminal building support by this base of new, larger, weapons and weapon components of the various new systems has so outmoded this facility, that expansion to meet the new, larger heavier loads dictates the construction of a new facility. Base growth has placed the present facility in a congested area which impedes vehicle and aircraft traffic. The facility is scheduled to handle approximately 18 million pounds of freight per month.

The last item is for the depot support facility for the MINUTEMAN missile in the amount of $2,900,000.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Terminal airfreight DFRP	Unknown	59.7	20
Missile maintenance facility	do	(1)	0

[1] Unknown.

Mr. Sheppard. What are you using for an airfreight terminal at this facility at the present time, and what will you do with this if the new one is funded?

Colonel Parkhill. We presently have a very small temporary facility which is poorly located relative to the aircraft taxiing problem. We will tear this facility down when we get the new airfreight terminal.

Mr. Sheppard. You state this is the first increment. What is the total cost of this terminal in all of its increments?

General Minton. Let me answer that. It will be roughly twice that. The entire 87,000 square feet is now established as a requirement. This is somewhat unusual because, as you know, the MINUTEMAN is manufactured at Hill Air Force Base, and this will be used as a shipping and feeding point, not only the manufacture but the recycle and rehabilitation which must be done there. Three or four years from now we may find that the 49,000 feet that we are requesting here will be adequate. On the other hand, we may find we will need 87,000. If we need the 87,000, it will probably double the cost.

Mr. Sheppard. I assume you have given careful attention to the possibility of rehabilitation of the existing terminal; is that correct?

Colonel Parkhill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. Your statement is that it will be torn down?

Colonel Parkhill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. How soon after the buildings are up?

Colonel Parkhill. As soon as practical, sir.

Mr. Sheppard. The word "practical" covers a multitude of sins. On my recent trip I found many old buildings still standing where we had been told the old ones would be destroyed. There is quite a time element involved. I cannot understand, gentlemen, why commands

should be so obsolete in operation on that basis. Why can they not get rid of them? Do you not have enough funds to eliminate them?

General MINTON. Yes, sir; we have, Mr. Sheppard. We have a very energetic program to get rid of some of these old buildings. It does take quite a time. We get rid of them through our construction agency. From the time we declare them surplus until they can properly be disposed of through our disposal agent, it sometimes runs to 6 or 8 months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am talking about a building which has to be demolished, not excess because of usability. Is there a line of distinction in the declaration of excess to your requirement? There may be. I do not know.

General MINTON. Yes, sir; we have to excess them. We have to find out if there is a requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Irrespective of their condition?

General MINTON. Yes, sir. Very seldom do we ever find a requirement in the military or other Government agencies for them, but nevertheless we still have to go through that excess procedure. That particular phase of it does not take too long. It is just a matter of running through the regulation paperwork which is necessary. We advertise them. We sell them. The prospective buyer has a certain amount of time to tear them down and clean up the site.

(Additional information was supplied the committee as follows:)

PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSAL OF EXCESS BUILDINGS

1. When it is determined that excess buildings are located on sites of approved and funded new construction, the following disposal procedure is followed:

(*a*) If the buildings have not deteriorated beyond economical repair and are movable, they are screened with other Air Force installations and the Army and Navy.

(*b*) If no requirement exists after screening, a request for approval to dispose of the buildings (AF Form 300) is prepared by the base. Based upon an estimate of sale value, the request is for either disposal by demolition and salvage or for sale by the Corps of Engineers.

(*c*) In the event the estimated sale value is less than $5,000, the base commander may approve the disposal. If the estimated sale value is between $5,000 and $25,000 the major air command may approve the disposal. For those buildings with an estimated sale value in excess of $25,000, Headquarters USAF secures the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations).

(*d*) If the approval is to dispose of the buildings by demolition and salvage, it is accomplished by the base concerned. If the approval is to dispose of the buildings by sale, it is accomplished by the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers prepares and issues "Invitations to Bid" and sells the buildings to the highest bidder.

2. The above is the normal procedure. Deviations may occur if considered to be in the best interest of the Government. For example, the Corps of Engineers may include the requirement to dispose of unserviceable buildings in the "Invitations to Bid" for the item of new construction.

General MINTON. Do you have some figures on this?

Mr. GIBBENS. I do have a few examples from our 1959 program.

For instance, at Otis Air Force Base we constructed 800-airmen dormitories. We have demolished 47 standard 63-man barracks.

At Brooks Air Force Base we built a 48-man BOQ. We have 12 two-story barracks which will be disposed of by July 1 this year.

Three buildings, incidentally, that we also considered for disposal, we now will have to keep for an extended period to house students for the School of Aviation Medicine.

At McClellan, the old dental clinic is still in use because the new facility has not been completed yet. We do have the paperwork started to get rid of the old facility.

At Tinker Air Force Base we had 400-airmen dormitories in the 1959 program. Twenty-eight buildings are currently being processed for disposal, and will be removed by June 1, 1960. Buildings formerly planned for disposal now require transfer to other activities on the base.

There are several others.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, could I make an observation at this point?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would agree with the chairman that to keep these facilities which must be gotten rid of on the base is out of order. By the same token, I would say I thoroughly agree with going through channels and making every effort to dispose of them by sale and by bid. The American people see so much waste in the military. Some of it cannot be avoided. I do not know anything that bothers the public more however than the burning or plowing under of material which the local people feel has some value, lumber and other things. While it may inconvenience you to some degree, I would hope that you would continue to make available through sale or for salvage anything that you can. That does not alter the general viewpoint I have. While I think you should do that, it should be done as expeditiously as possible.

KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we come to Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:KELLY AFB	GOVT LEASED :	25
DIR TO TOWN	:6 MI ENE SAN ANTONIO	GOVT OWNED :	3,841
COUNTY, STATE	:BEXAR TEXAS	OTHER ACRES :	596
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	4,462
COMMAND	:AMC		
		DATE OCC :	1917
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:HQ SAN ANTONIO AMA LOG SUP SQ USAF SECURITY SERV HQ FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ANG) TRP CARR WG (RES)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
597	45	3,190	50	3,882		21,502

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
105,000	88,555	8,348	8,097	769	7,328

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ELECTRNC LAB COM TST	227	USS	NEW	14,875		14,875	14,875	SF	283
ELECTN A/C SUPPORT MOD	135			AR		LS		LS	486
									769

KELLY AIR FORCE BASE

Kelly Air Force Base is the next location to be considered. It is located 6 miles southwest of San Antonio, Tex. Its planned use is for the headquarters of the San Antonio Air Materiel Area, a depot, and a troop carrier mission. It also serves as the headquarters of the Air Force Security Service. The program being requested at Kelly AFB involves two items at a cost of $769,000.

The first item will provide for an electronics laboratory in the amount of $283,000, to support the Air Force Security Service. There is no suitable existing building available at Kelly Air Force Base that can be used for this specialized activity. The requested facility will be used for testing and fabrication of electronic equipment and will house the U.S. Air Force Cryptographic Equipment Laboratory.

The next item in the amount of $486,000 provides for additional power and electrical outlets required to support the modification, overhaul maintenance program for aircraft in the aircraft repair hangar, building 375, at this base.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Electronic laboratory communication test.	Phillip G. Norton Associates	$15	0
Electrical aircraft support modification.	District engineer (Kelly)	23	100

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the reason for crowding additional facilities into this already crowded space?

Colonel PARKHILL. The first item is an electronic lab communication test, a new function, new in its present scope. It is for the security service, where radio equipment bought on the open market is modified for use in their oversea locations. The second item is to provide heavy duty electrical equipment in a large hangar and on the apron. These facilities are being used for the modification of the B–52.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because of your crowded facilities here, is there not some other place that this could be better applied, where it would be more readily adaptable?

Mr. GIBBENS. May I help on that, Mr. Chairman? The runway at Kelly is a fairly substantial runway. The second item here is for the maintenance which is currently being performed at Kelly and will increase the reliability of the continuity of the maintenance cycle. During certain maintenance on the B–52's now, the electrical system occasionally breaks down. With this in there, we can continue the maintenance all the way through. At times we have to go clear back to the start of the cycle and start all over again.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can we assume, with these added facilities in this area, you will not come here later and say, "Now we have to have an extended runway here"?

Mr. GIBBENS. No, sir. I believe that the runways at Kelly are in pretty good shape. As I remember, they are 10,000 or 12,000 feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your congestion there, then, will not in any manner create an undesirable operational factor, is that correct?

General MINTON. No, sir.

M'CLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up McClellan Air Force Base, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:MCCLELLAN AFB	GOVT LEASED :	1
DIR TO TOWN	:7 MI SW SACRAMENTO	GOVT OWNED :	2,577
COUNTY, STATE	:SACRAMENTO CALIF	OTHER ACRES :	166
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	2,744
COMMAND	:AMC	DATE OCC	1936
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:HQ SACRAMENTO AMA AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING WG (ADC) WEA RECON SQ (MTC) AIR RES FLYING (RES)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/RQT	BASE	TRANS/RQT		NATIONALS	DAF
876	54	4,038	120	5,088		14,847

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
109,000	83,278	18,962	6,760	1,470	5,290

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RAPCON CENTER		124		NEW	6,034		6,034	6,034	SF	380
LIGHTING, APPROACH	DFRP	473		NEW	3,000	1,500	1,500	3,000	FT	320
STANDARDS CAL. LAB D		129		NEW	10,000		10,000	10,000	SF	469
SHOP COMM ELECT DEP	ADDN	131		NEW	147,449	135,449	12,000	12,000	SF	301
										1,470

McClellan Air Force Base

The next location to be considered is McClellan Air Force Base, located approximately 7 miles northeast of the city of Sacramento, Calif. The planned use of this base is for the headquarters of the Sacramento Air Materiel Area, an Air Defense Command early warning unit, a MATS weather recon mission, and an Air Force Reserve activity. The program requested at McClellan amounts to $1,470,000. It consists of the following four items:

(*a*) The first item provides for a radar approach control center (RAPCON). This navigational aid facility will make possible the integration of civil and military air space in the Sacramento area. No facility exists or can be converted at McClellan that can be modified for this function.

(*b*) The second item provides for replacing the existing obsolete approach lighting system with the new national standard approach lighting system. This replacement of the nonstandard system is required in the interest of continuous and reliable air safety and efficiency of aircraft operations.

(*c*) The third item is a standards calibration laboratory which is needed to provide stability and precise atmospheric conditions for the adjustment of precision instruments. McClellan AFB has the responsibility for standards calibration and certification of test and calibration equipment utilized on first line aircraft, missiles, and SAGE.

(*d*) The last item is required for additional shop space for testing and overhauling of communication and electronic equipment. The project will provide for extension to an existing mezzanine area located within an existing shop building.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
RAPCON center	District engineer	$19	3
Lighting, approach DFRP	do	16	5
Standards calibration laboratory D	Unknown	28	4
Shop communication and electrical depot addition.	do	15	5

NORTON AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. Sheppard. Next comes the Norton Air Force Base, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:NORTON AFB	GOVT LEASED :	18
DIR TO TOWN	:3 MI W SAN BERNARDINO	GOVT OWNED :	1,982
COUNTY, STATE	:SAN BERNARDINO CALIF	OTHER ACRES :	100
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	2,100
COMMAND	:AMC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:HQ SAN BARNARDINO AMA AIR DIV HQ (SAGE) INSPECTOR GEN GRP		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
610	33	1,520	18	2,181		10,560

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
60,000	48,727	6,719	4,554	169	4,385

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
REMOVAL, HAZARD	RELC	477	NEW					LS	169
									169

NORTON AIR FORCE BASE

Norton Air Force Base is located 3 miles east of San Bernardino, Calif. Planned use of this base is for the Headquarters of the San Bernardino Air Materiel Area, Headquarters of an Air Defense Command Division (SAGE) and an Inspector General mission. The request of $169,000 is for the removal of a flying hazard. The project will involve relocation of existing high voltage power lines that project above the glide slope path of aircraft using runway No. 5–24 at Norton.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Removal, hazard—relc	Unknown	$8.4	30

ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And next is Robins Air Force Base, Ga.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:ROBINS AFB	GOVT LEASED :	14
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI W WARNER ROBINS	GOVT OWNED :	6,723
COUNTY, STATE	:HOUSTON GEORGIA	OTHER ACRES :	159
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	6,896
COMMAND	:AMC		
		DATE OCC :	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION :HQ WARNER ROBINS AMA
LOG SUP SQ
14TH AF HQ (CNC)
HVY BOMB SQ(SAC)
AIR REF SQ (SAC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAF
802	70	3,330	44	4,246		17,199

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 58 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
114,000	73,833	32,915	7,252	1,478	5,774

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
OPER. MISSION, TNG		I	SAC	NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	73
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C		I	SAC	NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	650
STANDARD CAL LAB DEP	MOD	130		NEW	10,000	10,000		10,000	SF	261
SHOP ARM& ELECT	ADDN	351	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	116
STOR,BSE,JET,FUEL		475		NEW	84,213	54,000	30,213	20,000	BL	124
HEADQUARTERS, WING		36	SAC	NEW	10,050		10,050	10,050	SF	254
										1,478

ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE

Robins AFB is the next location to be considered. It is located 1 mile east of Warner Robins, Ga. The planned use of this base is for the Warner Robins Air Materiel Area Headquarters, a Logistical Support squadron and a Strategic Air Command bomber mission. The total program being requested amounts to $1,478,000.

Four items requested in this program are in support of the Strategic Air Command bomber mission for which construction was initiated through the fiscal year 1958 supplemental construction program. Nothing exists at Robins which could be utilized for these requested facilities. They include an addition to the existing target intelligence building which will provide space for simulators for training SAC combat crews. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large-type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program. Additional armament and electronic shop space is required to handle the increased workload. A new headquarters building is needed to house the SAC wing functions of administration, maintenance, supply, operational planning, and aircraft control activities.

The next base-type item provides for modification of an existing concrete building for a standard calibration lab. Robins has the responsibility for standards calibration and certification of test and calibration equipment for the Air Force activities located in this geographical area.

The last item will provide additional storage for jet fuel. The requirement is 84,213 barrels. The existing 54,000 barrels is insufficient to satisfy the base requirement. This request will provide additional on-base storage to support the various base and SAC operational missions.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Operation, mission, Tng	District engineer	$3.6	5
Maint dock large A/C	AMC	32.5	100
Standard cal lab dep mod	Unknown	13.5	0
Shop arm and elect addn	District engineer	5.8	5
Storage, base, jet, fuel	do	6.2	45
Headquarters, wing	do	13.0	5

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no specific questions. Have you any questions, Mr. Whitten?

Mr. WHITTEN. Looking at these priority numbers, they run all the way from 1 to 475. Is that a bringing back of prior items which have been too low on the totem pole, so to speak? I refer to several of these projects.

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir, it is not related particularly to prior items. As you know, we are required to put the last 25 percent of the program in numerical sequence. We do not believe this gives a true representation. We have already worked this program down quite a bit. We consider really all of these of equal priority.

Mr. WHITTEN. Storage room is included in this item. I notice you have storage for jet fuel at 475.

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. And headquarters, wing, at 36. Does that put comfort above use?

Colonel PARKHILL. I would not say that, sir. In the case of the jet fuel, we have 54,000 barrels of our 84,000 barrel requirement. We feel that it is important to bring that up to the requirement or close to the

requirement. Whereas in the case of the headquarters, wing, we have no space for this activity.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was looking at that item, but I notice that throughout the presentation, also. I was trying to get it straight. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

STOCKBRIDGE TEST ANNEX, N.Y.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall pick up the Stockbridge Test Annex, N.Y.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:STOCKBRIDGE TEST ANNEX	ANY LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI MERRILLSVILLE	GOVT OWNED	:224
COUNTY, STATE	:MADISON, NEW YORK	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:224
COMMAND	:AMC		
		DATE OCC	:UNK
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:R&D GROUND ELEC & COM EQPT		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/RQT	BASE	TRANS/RQT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
		15		15		20

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
2,681	28		2,653	2,653	

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ELEC LAB INTERF REDU	I	ARD	NEW	35,888		35,888	35,888	SF	2,653
									2,653

STOCKBRIDGE TEST ANNEX

The next location is Stockbridge Test Annex located approximately 1 mile northeast of Merrillsville, N.Y. Planned use of this annex is in support of Rome Air Development Center, Griffiss Air Force Base. The total program being requested is $2,653,000 and involves one item for an electronics interference reduction lab. This facility is vital to satisfy the need for research in the fields of measuring electronmagnetic interferences and evaluation of anti-jam capabilities of receivers.

There is no facility at Griffiss Air Force Base or in the vicinity adequate to perform the tests. Space is required where outside sources will not interfere with the tests being conducted, or where equipment under tests will not interfere with other equipment which may be situated within its operational environment such as, operational radar or communications equipment and flight test.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Electronics Interference Reduction Laboratory.	August Lux and Associates	$130	24

Mr. SHEPPARD. How do you carry on this work at the present time, gentlemen?

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, this is accomplished to a limited degree by contract. However, I would like to make a point that we consider extremely important. We really need to be able to do this work inhouse in order to establish the proper standards and specifications that we use in the purchase of equipment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What portion of this can be accomplished in other Government facilities or in private industry or in other institutions? Has that been surveyed?

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, I would like to furnish that for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are the other services handling the same problem, if you know, gentlemen? Has any check been made?

Colonel VILLONE. There is no place in the United States today where we can run electronic equipment under controlled environment as we want to do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will this require the purchase of additional land, gentlemen?

Colonel VILLONE. Four acres of land.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of it and what is the purchase price?

Colonel PARKHILL. It is agricultural land. The total cost is $1,000.

TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now take up Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:TINKER AFB	GOVT LEASED :	47
FIR TO TOWN	:1 MI N MIDWEST CITY	GOVT OWNED :	3,359
COUNTY, STATE	:OKLAHOMA, OKLAHOMA	OTHER ACRES :	417
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	3,823
COMMAND	:AMC		
		DATE OCC :	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:HQ OKLAHOMA CITY AMA TRP CARR SQ (CNC) AIR TRANSP WG (MTC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
395	322	1,780	204	2,701		2,721

EST TOTAL COST ($000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 ($000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($000)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($000)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($000)	FUTURE YEARS ($000)
120,000	95,864	16,902	7,234	1,865	5,369

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($000)
COMLOGNET FACILITY	ADDN	I		NEW	16,845		16,845	16,845	SF	690
RAPCON CENTER	DFRP	125		NEW	6,034	1,796	4,238	6,034	SF	342
SHOP, HAZARDOUS TEST, DEPOT		132		149	70,602	46,626	23,976	23,976	SF	833
										1,865

TINKER AIR FORCE BASE

Tinker Air Force Base is the next location to be considered and is situated 1 mile south of Midwest City, Okla. The planned use of this case is for the Oklahoma City air materiel area and other Continental Air Command and MATS activities. The program requested at Tinker Air Force Base totals $1,865,000 and includes three items:

The first item provides for an addition to an existing logistical building to house the Tinker comlognet (combat logistics network) switching and terminal center. The requirement for this function is 16,845 square feet. No space is available at Tinker AFB that could be converted for this use. The comlognet is a consolidation of numerous existing communications networks to give the Air Force advanced high speed equipment and electronic data processing techniques for worldwide service. The failure to provide this centrally located major relay and switching center will preclude activation of the system in 1961 as scheduled.

The next item required is for a standard radar approach control center (rapcon) facility. The requirement for this navigational aid facility is 6,032 square feet. Air traffic control in the Oklahoma City terminal area is presently being accomplished in the overcrowded area (1,796 square feet) of a temporary addition to a maintenance hangar (building 240). The 6,034 square feet included in this request will provide the necessary space to permit the efficient operation of a full rapcon facility.

The last item is for a shop hazardous test depot. This item is urgently required in order to test the new J–57, SF–75, and TF–33–3 engines and accessories. This testing requires a larger space than is now available together with specialized types of utility service not presently available. The testing to be accomplished is of a hazardous type and cannot be performed without these facilities.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Comlognet facility, addition	Air Materiel Command	$34.0	20
Rapcon Center, DFRP	Unknown	17.5	5
Shop, hazard test	Nolen & Moore	41.0	100

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for existing hazardous test space at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. The present test facility is overcrowded. We consider it must be expanded to handle the projected workload. We have 46,000 square feet, and we are proposing an addition of 23,000 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to the assignment of all or a portion of the additional workload at Tinker to other bases of the Air Materiel Command?

Colonel PARKHILL. Colonel Urbach, have you anything on that?

Colonel URBACH. Sir, I would like to check that out further with AMC and provide the answer for the record as to what they have done regarding this matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will, please.

(The information requested follows:)

The workload of each depot having a hazard test capability was checked by AMC as to its ability to take some of the workload programed for Tinker Air Force Base. After an analysis of the workloads projected for each depot, it was concluded that the Tinker Air Force Base hazard test project is required.

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall turn to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB	GOVT LEASED	: 106
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI E FAIRBORN	GOVT OWNED	:7,737
COUNTY, STATE	:GREEN & MONTGOMERY, OHIO	OTHER ACRES	: 327
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:8,170
COMMAND	:AMC	DATE OCC	: 1917

PRINCIPAL MISSION :HQ AMC
WRIGHT AIR DEV HQ (ARDC)
HVY BOMB SQ (SAC)
AIR REF SQ (SAC)
USAF INST OF TECH
AIR TECH INTELLIGENCE CTR

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
3,276	407	3,291	100	7,074		18,961

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
267,000	158,370	92,037	16,593	4,325	12,268

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
HIGH ALTITUDE TNG	ADDN	474		NEW	7,863	4,141	3,722	3,722	SF	125
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C		I	SAC	NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	700
SHOP ARM&ELEC	ADDN	352	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	127
SC.LAB, POLYMER RES	MOD	I	ARD	NEW	18,082		18,082	18,082	SF	651
SCIENCE LAB,MEDICAL		I	ARD	149	107,244	38,404	68,840	68,840	SF	2,515
HOT WATER HEAT FAC.		134		NEW	37,205	33,475	3,730	730	FT	108
RAILROAD TRACK	EXTD	476		NEW	60,631	52,054	8,577	3,700	FT	99
										4,325

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE

The last Air Material Command location to be considered is Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. This base is located 1 mile west of Fairborn, Ohio. The planned use of this base is for the Headquarters of the Air Material Command, for the Wright Air Development Center Headquarters, the Air Force Institute of Technology, the Air Technical Intelligence Center, and a Strategic Air Command bomber mission. The total program requested for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base amounts to $4,325,000 and comprises seven items as follows:

The first item at Wright-Patterson is for a high-altitude training facility of 7,863 square feet. The existing 4,141 square feet is totally inadequate to provide the necessary training in ejection seat and parachute techniques, night visions, and pressure suit indoctrination. Personnel from a large geographical area will utilize these training aids. The requested 3,722 square feet will complete the requirement for such a facility at Wright-Patterson.

The next two items requested in this program are in support of the Strategic Air Command bomber mission for which construction was initiated through the fiscal year 1958 supplemental construction program. They include procurement and erection of two additional docks to be used for inspection and repair of the SAC bomber aircraft, and will substantially fill the outstanding deficiency at Wright-Patterson. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large-type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program. Additional armament and electronics shop space is required to accommodate added functions due to an increase in electronic equipment assigned to the SAC mission aircraft. The items when constructed will complete the total requirement at this installation.

The polymer research lab is required to support the research and development mission program at Wright-Patterson Air Development Center. An existing maintenance building will be converted into a laboratory to be used for polymer research. Polymer materials such as plastics, elastomers, fluids, lubricants, fiber and high-energy propellants will be used in the complex development of advanced weapon systems.

The next item is the science laboratory polymer research. This facility is required for the research necessary to the development of materials of high molecular weight. These materials have found wide use in the fabrication of nose cones, rocket engine nozzles, and associated applications. The Air Force requires this facility for its own development of materials of extreme environments of temperature to use in its weapon systems, since many of these materials, because of their characteristics, will not be required or developed for commercial application.

The next item is a hot water heat facility to provide a primary source of heat for the base hospital. Frequent outages have occurred over the past several years in the old hot water primary source lines from area C. These facilities have required establishment of additional temporary boilers adjacent to the hospital facility. These boilers are presently operating in an emergency-type tarpaulin-covered enclosure. This project will eliminate this emergency-type operation.

The last item is for the extension of a railroad spur into Wood City heating plant area. This extension will then provide adequate economical transportation to handle some 168 tons of coal each day into this area. The distance coal has to be transported is 2½ miles and the use of trucks for this purpose is uneconomical and unsatisfactory.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completion
High-altitude training addition	Unknown	$6.0	0
Maintenance dock, large aircraft	AMC	35.0	90
Shop armament and electronic addition.	Unknown	8.0	0
Science laboratory polymer research modification.	do	32.0	0
Science lab medical	Lorenza & Williams	125.0	100
Hot water heating facility	District engineer	5.0	0
Railroad track extended	do	5.0	0

Mr. SHEPPARD. How is the Air Force handling the work at the present time for which you are requesting the modification of the science research laboratory? Can anybody here answer that?

Colonel VILLONE. This science laboratory is for research in polymers. Our current effort in this area is limited to such a degree by the lack of proper laboratory space and equipment, that we are not able to accomplish the research work we plan to do in this laboratory. Examples, are use of extremely high temperature or pressures in polymer research.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What portion of this work is capable of being performed in other Government facilities or in private industry? If you can answer presently, go ahead and answer. If you cannot, refer it to AMC.

Colonel VILLONE. I will have to furnish that for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

There are no Government facilities which are capable of performing the work which is to be done in this lab. Similarly, our experience with private industry has proven that basic research aimed at the synthesis of new polymers for use in our weapon systems must be developed by the Air Force. We have found that industry is reluctant to do the type of polymer research work needed by the Air Force since they see a very limited commercial application of these products. For example: The polymers we need range from thin liquids which can conceivably be used as lubricants with a temperature range from —650° F. to +500° F., as well as solid materials which can be used for hoses and seals for rocket fuels and oxidizers. In summary, this lab is to enable us to do those different and unique experiments concerned with polymer research which are not being done elsewhere.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice the medical science laboratory costs have increased from $2,277,000 last year to $2,515,000 this year. I assume this is based on detailed plans and specifications. Last year the Congress eliminated this item from the funding program and suggested a study of aerospace medical facilities. What consideration has the Department of the Air Force given to the combining of this workload with the School of Aviation Medicine, for example, at Brooks Air Force Base?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Mr. Sheppard, the Department of Defense prepared a study in which they investigated the entire question of consolidation of the medical research facilities within the Department of Defense, and particular attention was paid to the present facilities, two of them being the School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks and the Aerospace Medical Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The two functions are different in that the school function at the School of Aviation Medicine is for basic research, whereas the Aerospace

Medical Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is in direct support of the weapons systems development conducted at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Therefore, both facilities are necessary, and are properly located. There is no duplication between the two functions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary to establish a new so-called behavioral science division here instead of at Brooks or some other location? Does the report cover that aspect of it?

Colonel VILLONE. It does, Mr. Chairman. As Colonel Carmichael pointed out, they have a basic research responsibility at Brooks. At Wright-Patterson we have a mission of applied research and development. When we speak of behavioral sciences, this is in the development area, developing the type of equipment that the man would operate as well as determining his ability to operate it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to understand from your answer, sir, that Brooks has been surveyed very carefully and that the workload is not available there and cannot be made available there as against the funding requirements you have here, costwise? Am I to assume your answer covers that aspect of it?

Colonel VILLONE. Yes, sir. We have surveyed Brooks. There are no facilities available there.

Mr. GIBBENS. Mr. Chairman, on these two items I have a brief statement covering the functions of each. I have it here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it might be well at this point if you presented it. How lengthy is it?

Mr. GIBBENS. Very short.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go right ahead.

Mr. GIBBENS. The School of Aviation Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base, Tex. The Aerospace Medical Center, Brooks Air Force Base, fundamentally is engaged in training in basic research on aviation medicine problems associated with maintaining the health and efficiency of Air Force personnel.

The Science Laboratory, Aeromedical, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. The Aerospace Medical Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, conducts research and development on the aeromedical and human engineering aspects of modern weapons systems. Examples are: Integration of man into aircraft control systems and providing protective and survival equipment such as pressurized flying clothing. This work is most effective when it is done in close association with the complex aeronautical laboratories presently located at WADC. The development of protective clothing and survival equipment is an essential part of the WADC mission of weapons system development.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What experiments are being carried on at this laboratory which could not be handled at existing Government or private facilities? Has any study been made in that field? Now then you may prepare an answer to that for the record, please.

(The information requested follows:)

Very few if any of the experiments conducted in this laboratory can be done elsewhere. The work done by the Aerospace Medical Laboratory requires close and active association with the weapon system project offices and other activities, i.e. aeronautical, research, materials, aerial reconnaissance laboratories, etc., and other facilities which are immediately available at Wright Air Development Division.

The applied research in progress on the human components of weapon systems at the Aerospace Medical Laboratory is in direct support of the weapon system and equipment development programs at WADD. This work of the Aerospace Medical Laboratory is accomplished in the following proportions: Direct AF effort, 35 percent; AF sponsored contract effort, 65 percent.

Our research in relation to the human aspects of future aerospace systems needs to be substantially increased. The addition of this laboratory will provide for expansion of the most effective component of the program, the Air Force direct effort. The experience of the Aerospace Medical Laboratory over many years clearly demonstrates the most responsive and economical manner to do this type of applied research and development is through direct AF efforts. The ability of the program to maximize the effectiveness of man in weapon systems is crucially dependent upon immediate and frequent coordination with those laboratories of the Wright Air Development Division which are developing the other elements of these weapon systems.

AFTERNOON SESSION

MINUTEMAN FACILITIES AT HILL AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Come to order, gentlemen. I would like to pick up the matters reflected on page 213 of the justifications having to do with Hill Air Force Base.

With reference to that particular project, you have two line items. What is the status of your plans for the MINUTEMAN facilities?

General MINTON. At Hill Air Force Base five buildings will be constructed probably on base. This will be the recycle or the repair facilities.

On an Army arsenal adjacent to Hill Air Force Base is being built the assembly facilities for MINUTEMAN. There will be about six buildings identical to the recycle buildings built as part of production. This multiplicity of buildings is due to the explosion hazard quantity-distance formula.

The architect-engineer for Boeing Aircraft, who is doing the industrial facilities not funded out of this particular program, is designing those manufacturing facilities. Since the recycle facilities will be identical with the manufacturing facilities, we intend to site adapt this design, with whatever modification we consider advisable. There will be very few, but we intend to site adapt that facility to the Hill Air Force recycle requirements. They are being designed now.

The status of design is they are through the definitive drawings. We reviewed those about 3 weeks ago on the industrial facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can I assume this location was selected upon the proximity aspect?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration did you give to other locations where perhaps existing facilities might have been used?

General MINTON. This ties in with the manufacturing facilities. The manufacturing facility for the engine is at Brigham City. The assembly of the engine, the missile itself, is on this Army arsenal facility right adjacent to Hill Air Force Base. The repair and recycling facility will be on Hill Air Force Base, so all three are together.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for similar overhaul of ATLAS and TITAN?

General MINTON. We had no specific facility for the overhaul of ATLAS and TITAN; the present concept at this time is to do that on the support base. We are building an assembly building for each of those sites at the support base. There will be times, undoubtedly, when these missiles will be flown back to the factory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you not do the same thing for the MINUTEMAN?

General MINTON. This will be, I think, when we actually get into the numbers involved the way it will work. But as it is right now, we have the manufacturing facility and the recycle facility tied right side by side. It is going to be difficult to put the ATLAS missile on an airplane and fly it around too much. The MINUTEMAN, being a much smaller missile, smaller in diameter, we can handle it. I do not think there will be the requirement for repair, maintenance, and modification of MINUTEMAN, being the solid propellant missile, that there will be for the ATLAS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Upon what basis do you state in your justifications that this is for the periodic overhaul of the MINUTEMAN missile?

General MINTON. At the present time we are programing for production—this is classified information. May I go off the record?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your figure insofar as the full strength aspect is concerned in the MINUTEMAN category?

General MINTON. This would have to be off the record, too.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis for the June 1962 operational requirement, as such?

General MINTON. For research?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

General MINTON. We questioned that as to the requirements to put the recycle facility in this program. We discussed it in detail and I discussed it personally with General Bennet, Chief of Maintenance. We finally went back to AMC and asked them to justify it if they had to have it in the 1961 program. Otherwise we proposed to put it in the 1962 program.

They came back with a very strong justification—certainly to the satisfaction of the Director of Maintenance—that it had to go in the 1961 program in order to be certain we had this facility in time to get it shaken down to take care of this recycle requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is anticipated insofar as time is concerned for the first cycle?

General MINTON. I believe it is June 1963, but I will check it.

(The information requested is as follows:)

The MINUTEMAN Recycle Facility at Hill Air Force Base will be required initially in July 1962 for the following reasons:

1. To complete the training of shop and supervisory personnel.
2. To establish and validate the maintenance procedures and practices necessary for support of the full tactical inventory.
3. To completely shake down the maintenance tools and test equipment.
4. To repair such missiles that fail prematurely.
5. To begin the maintenance schedule to prevent accumulative buildup of recycle backlog which would occur if entire inventory is allowed to run full 3-year cycle.

Air Research and Development Command

Mr. Sheppard. Now we shall turn our attention to Air Research and Development Command. Please place page 248 of the justifications in the record at this point.

(The page follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Arnold Engineering Development Center	Air Research and Development Command	$10,500
Edwards Air Force Base	do	357
Eglin Air Force Base	do	2,072
Holloman Air Force Base	do	467
Kirtland Air Force Base	do	3,296
Laur G. Hanscom Field	do	1,741
Patrick Air Force Base	do	3,248
Antigua test site	do	277
Cape Canaveral	do	1,556
Wideawake Field	do	288
Sacramento Peak	do	235
Total		24,037

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER, TENNESSEE

Mr. Sheppard. Now, we shall pick up the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	ARNOLD ENG DEV CTR	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	8 MI N MANCHESTER	GOVT OWNED	41,444
COUNTY, STATE	COFFEE, TENN.	OTHER ACRES	1
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	41,445
COMMAND	ARDC	DATE OCC	1951
PRINCIPAL MISSION	RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
45	12	28	12	97		3384

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
322,000	198,622	87,389	35,989	10,500	25,489

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
PROP.ENG.ALT.TST.CEL	I		NEW					LS	10,500
									10,500

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The first location in the Air Research and Development Command is the Arnold Engineering Development Center located 8 miles south of Manchester, Tenn.

The planned use of this center is to operate research and development activities for industry, educational institutions, and governmental agencies to further the development and evaluation of aircraft propulsion systems and guided missiles. This program contains a request for $10,500,000.

The item included in this program is a propulsion engine altitude test cell, which is required for testing rocket engine propulsion systems up to 500,000-pound thrust under simulated altitude conditions. No facility exists which can provide simulated altitude testing of rocket engines of this size.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Propulsion engineering altitude test cell.	Svererup & Parcel	$450	30

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for propulsion engineering altitude test facilities at the present time?

Colonel VILLONE. In existence today is one small rocket engine test cell at Arnold Engineering Development Center with 50,000 pounds' thrust capacity, the only one in existence where we can test engines under simulated altitude conditions. We surveyed NASA and industry and there are no plans for constructing a similar large capacity test cell. NASA has written us and said the most they contemplate building is a 30,000-pound altitude test cell for rocket engines.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does this compare with similar work carried on by the Space Agency, if you know?

Colonel VILLONE. As I stated, the only work the Space Agency is doing is in the small 30,000-pound range.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the comparability regarding the propulsion engine test cell which the committee funded last year and the one to which we are presently addressing ourselves?

Colonel VILLONE. The one the committee funded last year has the ability to accommodate an engine up to 200,000 pounds' thrust. This cell has the initial capability of 500,000 pounds' thrust with growth potential up to 1,500,000 pounds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is my information the Space Agency is developing a heavier thrust than you people are providing for here. If they do not need them, why do you have to have them?

Colonel VILLONE. Sir, we need this to do product improvement and improve reliability of our TITAN, MINUTEMAN engines, both in the later versions of these missiles as well as the application of these engines in the DYNASOAR program and others. We find when

these engines run at altitude, the characteristics vary greatly from sea level operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In reality, gentlemen, the answer to the question I have asked you, based upon the Space Agency function and yours, is that by constructing this particular propulsion device we are talking about here, it will be made available to other agencies in like character of work or experimentation for determination or evaluation?

Colonel VILLONE. Correct.

EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is the Edwards Air Force Base in California.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	EDWARDS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI W ROSAMOND	GOVT OWNED	300,373
COUNTY, STATE	KERN, CALIF.	OTHER ACRES	2
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	300,375
COMMAND	ARDC	DATE OCC	1940

PRINCIPAL MISSION: AF FLT TEST CTR HQ
FLT TEST PILOT SCHOOL
2 FLT LINE MAINT SQS
TRANSPORTATION SQ
BALLISTIC MSLE STATIC TESTING
AACS SQ (MTC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
375	10	2457	15	2857		5189

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
160,000	114,040	14,266	31,694	357	31,337

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ELECT. LAB. CAL	ADDN	424		149	9,600		9,600	9,600	SF	272
PROPL.ET.MACH.SHOP	ADDN	I		NEW	50,402	23,838	26,564	2,400	SF	85
										357

EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE

The next location is Edwards Air Force Base, located approximately 2 miles east of Rosamond, Calif.

The planned use of this base is for an Air Force flight test center headquarters and for the static testing of rocket engines. The total program being requested is $357,000, consisting of two items as follows:

The first item is an electronics laboratory, calibration; required to install presently available and programed equipment which is necessary for calibrating instrumentation and test equipment used in the center's test programs. Lack of adequate space prevents the effective use of a large percentage of this equipment, thereby adversely affecting the performance of the base mission.

The second item is for an addition to the propulsion engine test machine shop at the rocket test site. This item is required to house additional machines and equipment to support the ballistic missile and Air Force astronautical projects.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Electronics laboratory, calibration, addition.	Austin, Field & Fry	$13.5	90
Propulsion test machine shop	Unknown	4.0	5

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no specific question because it is more or less repetitious. There is nothing outstanding in this presentation compared with those of like character you have presented, is there?

General MINTON. No, sir.

EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	EGLIN AFB	GOVT LEASED	43
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI NE VALPARISO	GOVT OWNED	465,053
COUNTY, STATE	OKALOOSA, FLA.	OTHER ACRES	17
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	465,113
COMMAND	ARDC	DATE OCC	1935
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR PROVING GROUND CTR HQ AIR BASE WG 3 MAINT SQS 2 MAINT SQS (SAC) AACS SQ (MTC) AIR RESCUE SQ (MTC) HVY BOMB SQ (SAC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
1170	108	5725	125	7128		3918

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 19 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
124,000	85,412	27,554	11,034	2,072	8,962

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING,APPROACH	56		NEW	4,500	1,500	3,000	3,000	FT	203
FIRE STATION,LINE	342	SAC	NEW	22,759	10,672	12,087	5,590	SF	136
MAINT.DOCK,LARGE A/C	I	SAC	NEW	6	3	3	1	EA	386
AUTO MAINT.SHOP DFRP	420		NEW	45,000	6,572	38,428	27,000	SF	564
SHOP ARM & ELECT ADDN	345	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	126
TEST RANGE,G/M ELEC	426		NEW			12,000	12,000	SF	225
STOR,BSE,M/CUBIC,MAG	I	SAC	NEW	14,402	11,520	2,882	2,882	SF	70
WHSE,SUP.& EQUIP,BSE	32	SAC	NEW	61,004		61,004	33,750	SF	262
CHAPEL ANNEX	244		NEW	8,737	977	7,760	3,840	SF	100
									2,072

Eglin Air Force Base

The next location to be considered is Eglin Air Force Base, located 2 miles southwest of Valparaiso, Fla.

The planned use of this base is for the air proving ground center headquarters and a SAC bomber mission. The program requested amounts to $2,072,000 and includes nine items as follows:

The first item will provide approach lighting for the existing 12,000-foot runway. Under low visibility conditions the pilots have difficulty in landings, and the installation of a standard lighting system is required to overcome this problem, enhance safety, reduce missed approaches, and increase air traffic flow.

Items 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 provide facilities in support of the SAC mission assigned to the base. These items consist of a fire station to be located in the SAC area, which is remote from the base proper; an additional maintenance dock for large aircraft, required to partly fulfill the existing deficiency; an addition to the armament and electronics shop is required to provide inspection and testing of complex electronic equipment installed in heavy bomber aircraft and will complete the requirement for this facility; additional multicubicle storage to complete the requirement for storage of weapons, and a new warehouse in the SAC area which is located about 5 miles from the base supply area.

The fourth item is for an auto maintenance shop to replace the existing substandard shop which is a fire and structural hazard and is scheduled for demolition.

The sixth item is for an addition to the Eglin gulf test range required for testing missiles with increased capability, and is needed to augment those facilities previously programed for guidance, tracking, range safety, and supply backup.

The ninth item is for an annex to the existing chapel in the Ben's Lake housing area, required to partly fulfill the deficiency of religious educational facilities for assigned personnel.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Lighting approach	District engineer	$10.1	5
Fire station, line	do	6.8	30
Maintenance dock, large aircraft	AMC	16.5	50
Auto-maintenance shop	AMC	28.2	30
Shop, armament and electronic	AMC	6.3	5
Test range, guided-missile electronic	AMC	11.2	0
Storage base, multicubicle magazine	AMC	3.5	50
Warehouse supply and equipment base	AMC	13.1	5
Chapel annex	AMC	5.0	40

Mr. Sheppard. What are you using for maintenance facilities here at the present time and what will be done with those facilities if the new ones are funded and constructed?

Colonel Parkhill. You are referring to the auto-maintenance shop?

Mr. Sheppard. That is correct.

Colonel Parkhill. They have an old temporary, deteriorated building which we propose to demolish if this project is approved.

Mr. Sheppard. Why is it necessary to provide air conditioning for the administrative and records center of this shop in what has heretofore been considered an ideal climate?

Colonel Parkhill. Sir, this is under the authorized OSD criteria. It is in zone B, which authorizes air conditioning for administrative-type space.

Mr. Sheppard. What effect has the proposed revision of the BOMARC program had on your plans for the utilization of the Eglin test range?

Colonel PARKHILL. This should have no effect on it, sir. We will have a continued requirement for testing and crew training for the BOMARC as well as testing of air-to-ground missiles and target drones and tow targets.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No increase; no diminishing?

Colonel PARKHILL. Correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the effect of the complete cancellation of the BOMARC program on the utilization of this range?

Colonel PARKHILL. I do not believe it would have any effect, sir, because of the continued requirement for test of air-to-ground missiles and target drones.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why did you not provide for religious educational facilities when you constructed the new chapel at this installation instead of handling it as an addition in the present manner, which I can only assume will be somewhat more costly?

Colonel PARKHILL. That annex for the chapel at Eglin was in a prior program. However, during the compression of the program we were forced to squeeze out certain projects that we felt could be deferred to later years, and this fell in that category.

HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, we have the Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	HOLLOMAN AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI NE ALAMOGORDO	GOVT OWNED	8,691
COUNTY, STATE	OTERO, N. MEX.	OTHER ACRES	18
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	8,709
COMMAND	ARDC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AF MISSILE DEVEL CTR HQ AIR BASE GP DRONE SQ AACS SQ (DET) (MTC) FIELD DETERMINATIONS ACTIVITY (USA)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
289	34	2234	15	2572		4401

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
69,000	41,415	19,477	8,108	467	7,641

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP PARA&DINGHY BAS ADDN	421		NEW	12,709	10,789	1,920	1,920	SF	43
WATER SUPPLY STORAGE	430		NEW	2552,588	2019,588	533,000	533,000	GA	424
									467

HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE

The next location to be considered is Holloman Air Force Base, located 6 miles southwest of Alamogordo, N. Mex.

The planned use of this base is for the Air Force missile development center headquarters and for a drone squadron. The total program being requested is $467,000, consisting of two items as follows:

The first item is for an addition to the existing 10,789 square foot parachute and dinghy shop needed for the packing of parachutes up to 100 feet in diameter. Approximately 40 personnel and drag chutes and 36 system chutes are packed daily and the present T/O messhall structure located some 3 miles distant can only accommodate parachutes up to 44 feet in diameter. The completion of the requested item will satisfy total requirements.

The second item is for additional water storage required to provide adequate water to meet domestic and fire demands of the base, and preclude the necessity of curtailing activities in the critical technical areas during periods of high consumption. Included in this project are 8 miles of water mains to supply the launch area, captive missile test track, missile assembly, and laboratory area. The construction of this project will satisfy the total requirements for the base.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Shop para-dinghy base addition	Clark & Register	$2.1	5
Water supply storage	District engineer	21.2	5

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are two line items here. I have no questions pertaining to the first item. I might ask you about your water supply storage. What is the general situation?

Colonel PARKHILL. This project will provide some additional on-base storage and some distribution lines out to some of the facilities in the near range area, for example, the test track area.

As far as storage is concerned, they have a little over half of the requirement on base storage. The remainder is quite some distance off base.

KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, the Kirtland Air Force Base in New Mexico.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	KIRTLAND AFB	GOVT LEASED	17
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI NW ALBUQUERQUE	GOVT OWNED	2,838
COUNTY, STATE	BERNALILLO, N. MEX.	OTHER ACRES	270
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,125
COMMAND	ARDC		
		DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	SPEC WPNS CTR HQ FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC) FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ANG) SPEC WPNS ACTIVITY (USA) SPEC WPNS ACTIVITY (USN)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
804	92	3093	175	4164		1891

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
60,000	41,516	6,680	11,804	3,296	8,508

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY,OVERRUNS	418		NEW	66,666	8,333	58,333	33,333	SY	650
SHOULDER,STABIL.	419		NEW	173,993	13,285	160,708	160,708	SY	647
LIBRARY TECHNICAL	DFRP 57		NEW	27,600	9,884	17,716	16,000	SF	355
NUCLEAR WARFARE LAB	I		NEW	48,692		48,692	43,880	SF	1,580
LAND,FEE,PURCHASE	432		NEW				52,300	AC	64
									3,296

Kirtland Air Force Base

The next location to be considered is Kirtland Air Force Base, located 2 miles southwest of Albuquerque, N. Mex.

The planned use of this base is for the Air Force Special Weapons Center Headquarters and two fighter-interceptor squadrons, one of which is operated by the Air Defense Command, the other by the Air National Guard. The total program requested is $3,296,000 consisting of five items.

The first item is for a runway overrun at the west end of the primary runway which will release 1,000 feet of pavement that is now being used as an overrun, thereby increasing the effective length by 1,000 feet to provide additional capability and safety for mission aircraft. The additional length is of prime operational importance for this high-altitude base where the 12,774-foot runway is only equivalent to an 8,200-foot runway at sea level. Kirtland Air Force Base was the fourth busiest commercial airfield in the United States in 1958 and landings and takoffs have increased 10 percent in 1959. Sixty percent of all operations at this base utilize this runway.

The second item for shoulder stabilization along three taxiways is needed to provide ready access to runways for B–52's, reduce damage to jet engines caused from debris blown onto the taxiway and reduce the taxiway sweeping operation caused by each B–52 flight. Shoulder stabilization is considered a standard Air Force requirement for all heavy bomber bases. The construction of this work will satisfy the total requirement.

The third item for a new technical library is needed for the safe storage and reference use of known data relating to the science of nuclear fission. It will be a necessary tool for the Air Force Special Weapons Center mission, the Air Research and Development Command, and other Air Force units requiring technical knowledge of this particular science. The existing facility of 9,884 square feet is inadequate in size, is a fire hazard, and is of such poor construction that it is impossible to provide the needed security measures to safeguard the highly classified documents contained therein.

The fourth item is a nuclear warfare laboratory required for exploratory research involving new phenomena associated with the detonation of nuclear weapons at high altitudes. The requirements to be investigated relate to the field of induced communications and radar blackout, kill radii of our nuclear weapons, their vulnerability, especially at high altitudes, and other special tests.

The last item requested is for the acquisition of land needed to support the runway overrun work included in this program.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Runway, overruns	District engineer	$32.5	5
Shoulder, stabilization	do	32.5	5
Library, technical	do	17.8	5
Nuclear warfare laboratory	Flatow, Moore, Bryan and Fairburn.	119.3	5

Mr. Sheppard. What land in this area of New Mexico or any other area is worth $1,200 per acre outside of that incorporated within a municipality?

Colonel Parkhill. This is to purchase land for the runway overrun. This is $1,070 per acre. It is designated as commercial and industrial land, right off the end of the main runway, quite close to the area being developed for the commercial air terminal at Kirtland.

Mr. Sheppard. Has the county zoned that for industrial purposes or is it assumptive commercial purposes?

Colonel Parkhill. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My understanding while I was out there was there no legal declaration of zoning within the area. I may have been misinformed.

Colonel PARKHILL. This is based on our real estate planning report.

Mr. GIBBENS. This is based on a real estate planning report. The word I had was it was zoned industrial-commercial. The cost was developed by the Albuquerque district Corps of Engineers. It is based on four sales during 1959 in adjacent areas. We have had informal information from the engineers that they are coming in with a higher estimate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Higher than $1,200?

Mr. GIBBENS. Actually, it does break out to $1,070 an acre. Personally, I cannot help but think, too, that this is a right high price for this area, but it is adjacent to the industrial and municipal complex at the airfield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it has been declared by the political subdivision that has jurisdiction—be it municipality or county—as an established zoned area, that presents an entirely different picture. If it is what we call a real estate assumptive situation that it should be industrial, that is another story. You say it is zoned?

Mr. GIBBENS. That is the word I have. I would like to check it for the record and actually see whether it is in fact zoned or, as you say, assumptive.

(The information requested follows:)

The real estate planning report does not specifically state that the land in question is zoned by a political subdivision.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. How have you made out so far as this Air Force Base is concerned without the overrun and shoulder stabilization which you are requesting here?

Colonel PARKHILL. The overrun is, you might say, a long standing requirement. I believe they have a 12,000-foot runway. However, at that altitude, around 5,000 feet, actually it is the equivalent of around an 8,000-foot runway.

This is one of a number of overruns, part of our flight safety program to develop in each program some improved flying safety features. This falls in that category.

Regarding the shoulder stabilization, we have not been getting along very well in that regard. The B–52's and B–47's have outrigger gear. They are used at Kirtland in the special weapons testing. These outriggers track out into the desert off the edge of the taxiway and stir up a lot of debris, which is drawn into the jet engines and causes jet engine damage. We propose to stabilize shoulders on the taxiways used just by the test aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for the technical library facilities at this installation at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have some small World War II mobilization-type buildings. As I indicated, they are too small. They are short lived buildings. We propose to replace them with a permanent fireproof structure for the housing of the Nuclear Data Library of the Air Force.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming this request is funded, are you going to put them in standby mobilization character? Are they good enough to keep them in that classification?

Colonel VILLONE. The space we use now consists of three concrete cubicles used during World War II to store the Norden bombsight plus the temporary-type buildings. That is the extent of the space. We will not use any of it for this purpose, assuming this is furnished.

L. G. HANSCOM FIELD, MASS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up the L. G. Hanscom Field, Mass.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	L. G. HANSCOM FLD	GOVT LEASED	641
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI NNE BEDFORD	GOVT OWNED	924
COUNTY, STATE	MIDDLESEX, MASS	OTHER ACRES	456
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,021
COMMAND	ARDC	DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AF CAMBRIDGE RESEARCH CTR HQ AC&W SQ TEST GROUP (SUPPORT) AIR RESERVE (NAV TRNG) SQ (RES) AF CMD & CONTROL DEV DIV		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
504		1,300		1,804		5,719

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
64,000	47,280	7,293*	9,427	1,741	7,686

* Incl $4,200 AC&W

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ELEC.LAB,PLASMA PHYS	I		NEW	20,700		20,700	20,700	SF	870
Headquarters, Division	1		NEW	425,000	236,800	188,200	45,000	SF	871
									1,741

L. G. HANSCOM FIELD

The next location to be considered is L. G. Hanscom Field, located 2 miles south, southwest of Bedford, Mass.

The planned use of this base is for the Air Force Cambridge Research Center Headquarters and the Air Force Command and Control Development Division. The total program being requested is $1,741,000, consisting of two items.

The first item is for a plasma physics electronics laboratory. This facility is required to conduct research in gaseous and plasma physics which is needed to promote development in the performance of electronic devices and radiation weapons.

The second item is for a headquarters building required to relieve the crowded conditions of personnel in the Air Force Command and Control Development Division and the Electronics Systems Center.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Electronics laboratory, plasma physics.	Unknown	$43.5	0
Headquarters building	do	43.6	0

Mr. SHEPPARD. What work proposed for the electronics laboratory for plasma physics cannot be handled at other Government facilities or in private institutions?

Colonel VILLONE. None of the work we plan to do in this laboratory can be done elsewhere. The capability to do this work is nonexistent in the United States today.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not being done?

Colonel VILLONE. That is correct. It is not being done. Work in plasma physics today is being done where they study a specific aspect of plasma. An example is the plasma effect you get in the jet exhaust of a rocket engine. We want to do basic research as to how plasma is generated and how we can use it to advantage. It occurs in many instances such as, for example, when a missile reenters the atmosphere.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice reflected on page 274 of your justifications the following language: "As a consequence of research and development in these areas * * *"; "these areas" to me and to this committee would obviously mean more than one. Is that misphrasing?

Colonel VILLONE. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where was this research and development done, then, other than the one you are going to institute?

Colonel VILLONE. I am sorry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am trying to establish here is this: You want this particular item for the purpose of going into a highly specialized research and development category. Then I quote the following language: "As a consequence of research and development in these areas * * *." Does that mean you have been researching in this field in the area and you want this for refinement and definitive purposes, or just what does it mean? Explain it to me, if you will, please.

Colonel VILLONE. We encounter plasma in the exhaust of rocket engines, in the heating up of the nose cone when it reenters the atmo-

sphere, in a fluorescent light, in the Aurora Borealis. These are all examples.

The work they refer to in here, as you quote, concerns examples where we have observed plasma and we have found it generated problems such as interrupting communications during reentry of the nose cone, we have taken steps to determine how to overcome this effect, but it has been a matter of a compromise.

The purpose of this laboratory is to enable us to investigate the plasma in the basic research aspects so we can determine what it is in the plasma that gives this trouble, what properties of plasma can serve to our advantage. We do not know enough about it other than these manifestations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have established the manifestations first?

Colonel VILLONE. We have encountered them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You want to get further knowledge in that category?

Colonel VILLONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What administrative space do you have at Hanscom at the present time?

Colonel VILLONE. We have 205,500 square feet administrative space at Hanscom.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume that is not enough and that is the reason for the request.

Colonel VILLONE. Correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has your workload increased there to the degree the expansion is definitely apparent?

Colonel VILLONE. Yes, sir.

PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now turn to Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	PATRICK AFB	GOVT LEASED	
NEAR TO TOWN	2 MI N COCOA BEACH	GOVT OWNED	2,108
COUNTY, STATE	BREVARD, FLORIDA	OTHER ACRES	25
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,133
COMMAND	ARDC		
		DATE OCC	1949

PRINCIPAL MISSION
AF MSLE TEST CTR HQ
GUIDED MSLE SQ
COMM SQ
OPER SQ
SUPPLY SQ
ORD TEST UNIT (USN)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
506	134	1,818	116	2,574		6,079

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
80,000	59,895	9,054	11,051	3,248	7,803

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY INSTRUMENT	REHB	417		NEW	260,000	260,000		260,000	SY	2,132
SHOP,PLAT&SAND,DEPOT		422		NEW	6,532		6,532	6,532	SF	321
IE,MAINTENANCE SHOP		423		NEW	19,540	15,540	4,000	4,000	SF	95
ELECT TEST SHOP	ADDN	425		149	14,760		14,760	14,760	SF	348
SEWAGE,TREMT&DISP	MOD	59		NEW	1,500	1,500		1,500	TD	352
										3,248

PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE

The next location to be considered is Patrick Air Force Base, located 2 miles south of Cocoa Beach, Fla.

The planned use of this base is for the Air Force Missile Test Center Headquarters. The total program being requested includes $3,248,000 for 5 items at Patrick and $2,121,000 for 11 items at Cape Canaveral, and 2 other auxiliary stations. The total program cost is $5,369,000.

The five items at Patrick AFB are as follows:

The first item is for rehabilitation of the 9,000-foot primary runway with additions of an overrun, taxiway, warmup holding pad, and lighting. The existing runway pavement is inadequate in bearing strength for heavy aircraft and the additional work is required for operational safety and efficiency of aircraft supplying logistic support to the Atlantic Missile Range.

The second item, for a plating and sanding shop, is required for cleaning, dyeing or plating components of equipment used on the Atlantic Missile Range. The plating work is necessary because of the combination of high humidity, high temperature, and sandblown salt air from the ocean which subjects missile tracking and guidance equipment, support equipment, aircraft, and missiles to severe corrosion. The present shop is inadequate, poorly ventilated, and located within an existing hangar where it occupies space needed for field maintenance metal shops. There are no neighboring industrial facilities that can perform this work.

The third item is for a small installations engineer maintenance shop to be located in the newly developed Capehart housing area, which is too remote from the existing base maintenance shops for efficient maintenance.

The fourth item is for an electronics test shop required in the operation and maintenance of airborne instrumentation which is in direct support of IRBM and ICBM programs. This facility will provide the space necessary to maintain a satisfactory state of operation, calibration and repair of electronic airborne instrumentation installed in approximately 25 test support aircraft. It will also permit the presently used space in field maintenance hanger 313 to revert back to greatly needed field maintenance shop space.

The fifth item is to provide secondary treatment for the sewage. This treatment is required to bring the sewage to an acceptable standard before it is emptied into the Banana River. The State health department has requested the base to construct such a secondary treatment to reduce stream pollution.

One item at Antigua test site costing $277,000, will provide a communications and operations building, required to increase the communications capability on this expanding station to support all existing and new missiles programs. This base is being expanded from a secondary support station to one of primary importance on the Atlantic Missile Range. When the existing submarine cable in this range has been extended to this base, it will become a communications terminal for transfer of all messages and data from up-range subcable to down-range radio.

The nine items at Cape Canaveral, amounting to $1,556,000, are as follows:

The first five items for guided missile cable and support are for expansion of the instrumentation system to support the expanding program for testing guided missiles. These cables are needed to support expansion of the ICBM and IRBM launch areas, Atlantic Missile Range area and facilities in the port area. In addition, it will provide space for audio distribution amplifiers, data transmission and video switching, fire sequencers and programing equipment. The present plant cannot satisfy imposed data communication requirements efficiently.

The sixth item is for a warning system required to warn all personnel within a radius of 1,500 to 3,500 feet from a given launching pad that a hazardous condition exists prior to static firing of missiles.

The seventh item is for additional warehouse space, required for storage of materials which must now be stored outside, where they are subject to salt air and hurricane damage. While 44,000 square feet exists there is a total requirement for 93,000 square feet, leaving a deficit of 49,000 square feet and this request will satisfy only 80 percent of the total requirement.

The eighth item is to provide secondary treatment for the sewage, which is required to make the sewage acceptable for dumping into the Banana River. The Florida State Health Department has requested all municipalities adjacent to the Banana River to provide this secondary treatment of sewage effluent, as such measures are absolutely essential for the elimination of health and epidemic hazards.

The ninth item is for an 18-foot-wide roadway paralleling the existing main entrance road, required to accomodate the large increase in vehicular traffic supporting test programs at this base.

The last item at Wideawake Field on Ascension Island costing $288,000 will provide additional avgas storage to meet the full requirement for this station. At the present time, drums are used for storage, which presents a costly handling and resupply problem at this isolated area. The tankage, when constructed, will amortize the cost of this project in 3 years.

Design information

Line i tem	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Runway instrum ent rehabilitation	District engineer	$106. 6	10
Shop, flat, and sa nd depot	do	16. 0	10
IE. maintenance shop	do	4. 8	10
Electric test shop, addition	Walter Sotler Co	17. 4	90
Sewage treatment and disposal modification	District engineer	17. 6	10

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the existing runway facilities at Patrick at the present time and why is the relocation of this runway necessary?

Colonel PARKHILL. Regarding the nature of the runway, they have one runway which is failing. It was light-duty pavement and it is not holding up under heavy cargo loading. It is failing and requires rehabilitation.

It is also located too close to the main highway. The north end of the runway is only 790 feet from the highway itself. What we propose and what we really mean by relocation is to slip the runway a thousand feet to the south. To do this we will designate a thousand feet of the north end of the runway as overrun. We will rehabilitate the next 9,000 feet, designate that as runway, and build an overrun at the south end of the runway. We will get a usable 9,000-foot runway that is, as I indicated, moved southward so that airplanes approaching from the north are not too close to the highway.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it absolutely parallel with the one there now?

Colonel PARKHILL. The same one exactly. We are just moving it down a little.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, coming into the extreme end of the runway, you have no particular curvature involved here because of the immediate relation of where you are; is that not true?

General MINTON. That is correct. We just slip it south.

ANTIGUA TEST SITE, BRITISH WEST INDIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall consider the Antigua test site, British West Indies.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	ANTIGUA TEST SITE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI SW ST. JOHNS	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	ANTIGUA ISLAND,	OTHER ACRES	553
COUNTRY	B.W.I.	TOTAL ACRES	553
COMMAND	ARDC		
		DATE OCC	1957
PRINCIPAL MISSION	COLLECTION OF DATA FOR GUIDED MISSILES RANGE SAFETY AND WEATHER DATA COLLECTION		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
7	3	20	2	32		238

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
10,000	-0-	8,896	1,104	277	827

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
COMMUNICATIONS & OPS	I		NEW	5,600		5,600	5,600	SF	277
									277

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Communications and operations building.	Gibbe & Hill, Inc.	$13.8	10

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are asking for a communications and operations building and that the facilities be air conditioned for the electronic equipment. The explanation is comparable with like projects you have presented previously, insofar as its requirements are concerned; is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. It will provide for a transfer station for the uprange submarine cable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You say it is not feasible to expand the building because of its location. You mean its proximity to other buildings or just because of the geographical location?

Colonel VILLONE. The place we are accomplishing this work now is in the radio transmitter building. What we want to do here is essentially to provide a means of converting information received by radio means and retransmit it in our cable.

CAPE CANAVERAL MISSILE TEST ANNEX, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now turn to Cape Canaveral Missile Test Annex.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY — 1961

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	CAPE CANAVERAL MSLE TEST ANNEX	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI SSW PORT CANAVERAL	GOVT OWNED	14,738
COUNTY, STATE	BREVARD, FLORIDA	OTHER ACRES	129
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	14,867
COMMAND	ARDC	DATE OCC	1951
PRINCIPAL MISSION	ASSEMBLY, TESTING, LAUNCHING GUIDED MISSILES		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
52	188	657	160	1,057		9,396

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
150,000	87,123	48,989	13,888	1,556	12,332.

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
G/M INSTR.CAB.FAC		I		NEW	17,216	5,320	11,896	1,640	SF	53
G/M INSTR.CAB.FAC	ADDN	I		NEW	16,613	4,817	11,796	2,052	SF	56
G/M INS.CAB.TERM.BLD	ADDN	I		NEW	9,021	6,021	3,000	3,000	SF	76
G/M INSTR.CAB.FAC	ADDN	I		NEW	16,613	4,817	11,796	2,052	SF	51
G/MISSILE INSTR.BLDG	ADDN	I		NEW	54,873	53,573	1,300	1,300	SF	71
G/M PAD WARNING SYS		427		NEW	1		1	1	EA	103
WHSE.SUP.& EQUIP.BSE		429		NEW	110,640	61,440	49,200	30,000	SF	230
SEWAGE.TREMT&DISP	MOD	58		NEW				500	TD	122
ROAD		431		NEW	1030,613	917,913	112,700	62,000	SY	794
										1,556

Design construction

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
G/M instr. cab. facility	District engineer	$2.6	15
G/M instr. cab. facility addition	do	2.8	10
G/M ins. cab. terminal building addition.	do	3.8	15
G/M instr. cab. facility addition	do	2.7	15
G/M missile instr. building addition	do	3.5	15
G/M pad warning system	do	5.2	10
Wholesale supply and equipment base	do	11.5	10
Sewage treatment and disposal	do	6.0	10
Road	do	39.7	10

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for these facilities at the present time?

Colonel VILLONE. There are five facilities, all in the order of 1,600 to 2,000 square feet. They are to provide housing for communication cable junction points, such as the cable coming in from down range, to provide for connection of the land transmission line between Cape Canaveral and Patrick Air Force Base and also from Cape Canaveral to the commercial telephone exchange.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What specific missiles are involved in this program in the area and when will these facilities become available?

Colonel VILLONE. These facilities will become available in a matter of 6 to 9 months. They are simply a concrete or brick shelter over a junction box, a large junction box. The missiles involved are ATLAS, TITAN, and MINUTEMAN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those that are presently being handled there and, I suppose, additions if additions come in; is that correct?

Colonel VILLONE. Yes, sir.

WIDEAWAKE FIELD, ASCENSION ISLAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up Wideawake Field on Ascension Island.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	WIDEAWAKE FIELD	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI NW GEORGETOWN	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	ASCENSION ISLAND	OTHER ACRES	4,054
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,054
COMMAND	ARDC		
		DATE OCC	1956
PRINCIPAL MISSION	COLLECTION OF DATA FOR GUIDED MSLES		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
7	5	20	7	39		289

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 19 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
12,500	5,327	6,300	873	288	585

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
STOR,BSE,AVGAS	428		NEW	16,800	8,600	8,200	8,200	BL	288
									288

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Storage reservoir avgas	Alexis B. Kononoff, consulting engineer.	$14.4	10

SACRAMENTO PEAK, N. MEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is Sacramento Peak, N. Mex.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	SACRAMENTO PEAK	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	16 MI N CLOUDCROFT	GOVT OWNED	41,325
COUNTY, STATE	OTERO, NEW MEXICO	OTHER ACRES	42
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	41,367
COMMAND	ARDC		
		DATE OCC	1948
PRINCIPAL MISSION	SOLAR RESEARCH		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
2	1	16	1	20		84

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
3,500	2,258	542	700	235	465

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SC.LAP.SOLAR OBSRVTR	ADDN	I		NEW	23,669	12,200	11,469	3,936	SF	166
ELEC EMERG PWD PLT		I		149				200	KW	69
										235

Sacramento Peak

The last ARDC location to be considered is Sacramento Peak, located 16 miles south of Cloudcroft, N. Mex.

The planned use of this station is for solar research to develop methods for predicting sun-induced geophysical disturbances. The total program being requested is for $235,000 and includes two items.

The first item is for an addition to the solar observatory laboratory, required to house new equipment and personnel for the analysis and interpretation of data obtained from existing optical instruments. This interpretation is vital to the Air Force for increasing its knowledge of the operational environment of the upper atmosphere and near space. Further, computers and ancillary equipment available for data processing cannot now be installed because of lack of floor space.

The second item is for an emergency electric powerplant. This station is isolated on top of a 9,200-foot peak and must of necessity be complete within itself. Emergency power is a necessity for scientific, safety, and economy reasons. The research work requires continuous observation of solar activity and a power failure during the winter could subject the population to severe physical hardships.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
SC. Lab. solar observatory addition	W. G. Krueger & Associates	$8.3	9
Electric emergency pad plant	do	3.5	100

Mr. Sheppard. Why is it necessary to make the analysis and interpretation of observational data at this specific location?

Colonel Villone. As you are aware, this is the laboratory where we engage solely in observing the sun. We observe sunspots, magnetic storms, and so on. These have almost immediate effect on communications and weather on the earth. The relationship between the solar events and their effects within the earth's atmosphere is what we are trying to determine. By more quickly reducing data we can advise certain geophysical stations which exist throughout the world and alert them to the fact something is occurring on the sun and they can then immediately commence work to ascertain and analyze these effects on the earth's atmosphere.

Mr. Sheppard. Is this particular geographic location an outstanding location for this as opposed to other locations for this work? Is there specific value in selecting this location?

Colonel Villone. Primarily atmospheric. We are looking for a place with the least dust, smog, or other interference.

Air Training Command

Mr. Sheppard. Turning to the Air Training Command, we shall insert page 299 of the justification in the record at this point.

(The page follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request
		Thousands
Amarillo Air Force Base	Air Training Command	$1,460
Brooks Air Force Base	do	9,289
James Connally Air Force Base	do	524
Keesler Air Force Base	do	2,499
Lackland Air Force Base	do	3,022
Lowry Air Force Base	do	695
Mather Air Force Base	do	2,963
Moody Air Force Base	do	1,389
Perrin Air Force Base	do	3,654
Reese Air Force Base	do	268
Sheppard Air Force Base	do	1,532
Stead Air Force Base	do	457
Vance Air Force Base	do	292
Webb Air Force Base	do	917
Total		28,961

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall ask that appropriate justifications for the various projects under this category, not to be considered in detail hereafter, be inserted in the record at this point.

(The justifications follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	AMARILLO AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	11 MI W AMARILLO	GOVT OWNED	4,852
COUNTY, STATE	POTTER, TEX.	OTHER ACRES	942
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,794
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION

TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTER
HEAVY BOMB SQ (SAC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
673	206	10,259	1,478	12,616		1,521

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
86,000	40,620	34,727	10,653	1,460	9,193

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
PAD,WARMUP-HOLDING		I	SAC	NEW	45,300	30,000	15,300	15,300	SY	349	
WASHRACK,AIRCRAFT		327	SAC	NEW	4,540		4,540	4,540	SY	205	
FIRE STA.COMBINATION	DFRP	485		NEW	27,021	13,227	13,794	9,590	SF	255	
OPER.MISSION TNG.		I	SAC	NEW	7,000		7,000	7,000	SF	183	
SHOP A/C ENG I&R		I	SAC	149	18,344		18,344	18,344	SF	247	R
SHOP ARM&ELECT	ADDN	353	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	106	
SHOP GRND POW. EQ.		29	SAC	149	5,278		5,278	5,278	SF	115	R
										1,460	

Amarillo Air Force Base

The first Air Training Command installation to be considered is Amarillo Air Force Base, located 11 miles east of the city of Amarillo, Tex. The planned use of this base is for a technical training and a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission. The total program requested amounts to $1,460,000, comprising seven items as follows:

(*a*) The first item in this program for warmup holding pad is required at the southwest end of the primary runway, to increase the operational capability of SAC heavy bomber aircraft. It will permit final runup of engines, and allow instrument checks to be performed before takeoff, without interrupting normal traffic flow at the base. The item will satisfy the total requirement for the installation.

(*b*) The second item for an aircraft wash rack is needed to support the maintenance and operation of SAC heavy bombers. The accumulation of dirt, grime, and grease on aircraft increases airflow drag, aids corrosion, and slows the dissipation of heat from engines as well as preventing efficient aircraft inspections for airframe and mechanical failures. No facilities exist at this installation that can be used for this purpose.

(*c*) The third item for a combination fire station is needed to house three additional structural and two aircraft firefighting trucks assigned to this base. It will replace an existing, uneconomically repairable structure built some 10 years ago and is scheduled for demolition. The facility is needed to service SAC aircraft under emergency conditions, provide protection to some 14,000 assigned personnel at this installation.

(*d*) The fourth item for a SAC operational mission training facility of 7,000 square feet is required to house the training equipment and devices scheduled for Amarillo. The complicated aircraft and equipment now in use necessitate continuous training of both operational and maintenance personnel. Training devices have proven most beneficial and economical when crews change to new weapons systems. Their use prior to actual flight enhances flying safety through insuring knowledge of normal and emergency procedures.

(*e*) The fifth item for the aircraft engine inspection and repair shop is required to provide covered facilities for the accomplishment of jet engine minor repair and engine buildup of SAC aircraft assigned to this base.

(*f*) The sixth item is for an addition to the armament and electronic shop to provide additional storage and maintenance space required by the expanding and more complex electronic equipment installed in heavy bomber aircraft. The item when constructed will complete the total requirement at this base.

(*g*) The seventh item is a ground powered equipment shop. This building is required to provide for maintenance, servicing, and storing approximately 227 pieces of ground powered equipment for the base assigned aircraft. There is no existing facility which can be used to satisfy this requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Pad, warmup-holding	Unknown	$17	5
Wash rack, aircraft	do	10	5
Fire station combination DFRP	do	17	5
Operations mission training	do	12	5
Shop, aircraft engine inspection and repair.	District engineer	13	100
Shop armament and electronics	Unknown	7	5
Shop, ground power equipment	District engineer	12	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	JAMES CONNALLY AFB	GOVT LEASED	10
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI SSW LACY-LAKEVIEW	GOVT OWNED	1,749
COUNTY, STATE	MCLENNAN, TEX	OTHER ACRES	118
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,877
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	INSTRUMENT PILOT TRNG SCH PRIMARY BASIC NAVIG-SCH 12TH AF SQS (LOG SUPPORT) (TAC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,134	146	2,263	16	3,559		958

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
44,000	26,147	10,692	7,161	524	6,637

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING,R/W NGCL		483		NEW					LS	350
SHOP,PARA&DINGHY,BSE	DFRP	489		NEW	8,177	3,848	4,329	7,040	SF	174
										524

James Connally Air Force Base

James Connally Air Force Base is located 1 mile north-northwest of Lacy Lakeview, Tex. The planned use of James Connally Air Force Base is for navigational radar interceptor training and primary basic navigator training. The program requested for James Connally includes two items amounting to $524,000.

The first item entitled, "Lighting, Runway, Narrow Gage and Centerline," is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required at bases chosen as an area safe haven for recovery of aircraft during period of extremely bad weather conditions. It consists of a system of high intensity lights embedded 30 feet from and parallel to the centerline of the runway for the first 3,200 feet in the landing zone. From this point, smaller lights are embedded at regular intervals along the runway centerline for the remainder of the runway, to allow for accurate directional control and deceleration.

The second item in the program is for the replacement of a parachute and dinghy shop at this base. The existing structure, built in 1942, has badly deteriorated, walls have sagged and the roof leaks badly requiring excessive maintenance to retain it in a condition for use. Additionally, the space available in this building is less than half the area required to inspect, pack, and maintain the large numbers of parachutes and dinghies needed to support the flying mission. The old structure will be demolished upon completion of this facility.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting, runway, narrow gage and centerline	District engineer	$18	5
Shop, parachute and dinghy, BSE DFRP	Unknown	13	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	LOWRY AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI NW DENVER	GOVT OWNED	2,042
COUNTY, STATE	DENVER & ARAPAHOE, COLO	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,042
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1938
PRINCIPAL MISSION	TECH TRNG CENTER STRAT MSLE WG (SAC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
816	55	10,197	1,902	12,970		2,301

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
146,000	41,393	* 94,071	10,536	695	9,841

* Includes TITAN 93,700

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ELE.PRIMARY POWER	REHB	490		NEW					LS	471
ROAD	EXTD	322		NEW	518,180	485,630	32,550	24,000	SY	224
										695

Lowry Air Force Base

The next location to be considered is Lowry Air Force Base situated 1 mile southwest of Denver, Colo. The planned use of this base is for a technical training headquarters and missile wing for Strategic Air Command. The program requested for Lowry Air Force Base amounts to $695,000, involving the construction of two projects for Strategic Air Command.

The first item is for the elementary primary power addition of four 13,200-volt overhead circuits to the industrial area, technical training area, and missile assembly complex. Defense weapon systems have radically changed to highly technical missiles and aircraft armament, making technical training essential to national defense. Training aids used today require tremendous amounts of power and the existing system has been expanded to the point that further expansion is impossible without major rehabilitation.

The other item is for the extension of Sixth Avenue from abandoned taxiway west of the missile assembly complex to the east boundary of the base. This road will provide a straight, direct route to the missile sites or the vehicle maintenance area; both are imperative requirements for the TITAN missile operation. Adequate direct access must be provided to assure the success of the highest priority national defense TITAN missile operation.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Electric primary power	Unknown	$24	12
Road	do	11	20

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	REESE AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI E LUBBOCK	GOVT OWNED	2,391
COUNTY, STATE	LUBBOCK, TEX	OTHER ACRES	341
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,732
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1942

PRINCIPAL MISSION BASIC SINGLE ENG PILOT TRNG

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
345	10	1,908	15	2,278		660

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
25,000	14,400	6,230	4,370	268	4,102

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
FLIGHT SIMULATOR TNG	148		NEW	12,500		12,500	12,500	SF	268
									268

Reese Air Force Base

Reese Air Force Base is the next location to be considered and it is situated 6 miles west of Lubbock, Tex. The planned use of this installation is for basic single engine pilot training. The program contains a request for $268,000 for a flight simulator training facility. The project is required to house 11 T–38 flight simulators, which is a new mission requirement imposed by change of mission aircraft from T–33- to T–38-type aircraft. The use of flight simulators increases the effectiveness of personnel in the preliminary phases of pilot training, reduces training time and has proven more economical than use of aircraft for this purpose. No facilities exist or can be converted to house these training facilities.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Flight simulator training	Unknown	$17	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	STEAD AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	10 MI SSE RENO	GOVT OWNED	5,007
COUNTY, STATE	WASHOE, NEV	OTHER ACRES	24
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,031
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	HELICOPTER PILOT TRNG COMBAT SURVIVAL SCH HQ RENO ADS (SAGE-DC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/RQT	BASE	TRANS/RQT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
422	304	2,131	25	2,882		533

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
25,000	13,503	6,777	4,720	457	4,263

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TOWER,CONTROL	DFRP	486		NEW	1		1	1	EA	137
DISPENSARY	ADDN	152		NEW	31,400	16,400	15,000	6,300	SF	320
										457

Stead Air Force Base

The next installation to be considered is Stead Air Force Base. It is located 10 miles north-northwest of Reno, Nev. The planned use of the base is for Combat Survival School, helicopter pilot training, and Headquarters Reno SAGE ADC mission. The program requested for Stead amounts to $457,000, consisting of two items as follows:

The first item in the program, a control tower will replace an existing tower constructed in 1942, which is unsafe and must be vacated at frequent times due to extremely high winds. At such times, surveillance of air-borne operations is curtailed, creating hazardous conditions for aircraft. The existing tower is also too small to accommodate modern communication equipment needed to control both reciprocating and jet type aircraft. It is planned to dismantle this tower when the proposed facility is constructed.

The other item for an addition to the existing dispensary is needed, as present medical facilities designed for 23 beds is inadequate to handle the patient load. Further, due to physical layout of this structure, only three rooms are available for segregation of contagious and infectious diseases, precluding dependent inpatient and obstetrical care. The inpatient care averages 36 cases per day, and those requiring laboratory and surgical facilities must be sent to Travis Air Force Base and Letterman Hospital, approximately 250 miles away. During a recent 3-month period, the records indicated an average of 45 inpatient and outpatient care daily. Maternity cases averaged 65 per month at an approximate cost to the Government of $300,000 per year. The medical care program at this base will serve approximately 2,000 dependents and 6,800 military personnel entitled to Government medical services who are employed on the base, National Guard cadre and retired personnel.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Tower, control	District engineer	$7	5
Dispensary	Unknown	16	1

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	VANCE AFB	GOVT LEASED	27
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI NNE ENID	GOVT OWNED	1,803
COUNTY, STATE	GARFIELD, OKLA	OTHER ACRES	1,174
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,004
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION BASIC SINGLE ENG PILOT TRNG

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
348	7	1,723	3	2,081		725

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
29,000	15,563	7,892	5,545	292	5,253

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
FLIGHT SIMULATOR TNG	149		NEW	12,500		12,500	12,500	SF	292
									292

VANCE AIR FORCE BASE

The next location is Vance Air Force Base situated 3 miles south-southwest of Enid, Okla. The planned use of this base is for basic single-engine pilot training. The program amounts to $292,000 and includes the following item:

A flight simulator training facility is required to house 11 T–38 flight simulators scheduled for delivery in fiscal year 1962. This is a new requirement generated by a change in mission aircraft from T–33- to T–38-type aircraft. The use of simulators increases pilot effectiveness in the preliminary phases of training, materially reduces training time, and is more economical than actual operation of aircraft. The T–38 trainer simulator is a combination of procedures and instrument trainer which is designed to replace separate trainers now used for T–33 training. No facility exists that can be used or converted for this requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Flight simulator training	Unknown	$17	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	WEBB AFB	GOVT LEASED	1,248
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI NE BIG SPRINGS	GOVT OWNED	984
COUNTY, STATE	HOWARD, TEX	OTHER ACRES	197
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,429
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	BASIC SINGLE ENG PILOT TRNG FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
685	16	2,492	22	3,215		847

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
27,000	12,262	9,685	5,053	917	4,136

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING,APPROACH		144		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	325
A/C SHELTER,READY		444	ADC	NEW	4		4	2	EA	237
FLIGHT SIMULATOR TNG		150		NEW	13,300	4,764	8,536	8,536	SF	186
TEST STAND,JET	DFRP	487		NEW	2	1	1	1	EA	40
SHOP,REFUELING VEH	DFRP	488		NEW	3,516		3,516	3,516	SF	129
										917

Webb Air Force Base

Webb Air Force Base is the next location to be considered and it is situated 2 miles southwest of Big Springs, Tex. The planned use of Webb Air Force Base is for basic pilot training and an ADC fighter mission. The program requested for Webb amounts to $917,000 involving five items as follows:

The first item will provide standard lighting on the approach end of the primary instrument runway. Such lighting is essential to distinctly mark approach, overrun, and landing thresholds so as to form a visual coupler between the electronic low guidance approach and the visual references provided by runway lights. This facility will accommodate aircraft landing during poor visibility conditions.

The second project will provide a much needed shelter for ready aircraft normally parked on the operational apron. Sensitivity of modern aircraft electronic equipment to excessive moisture, heat and dust requires that these aircraft be sheltered from the elements. Requirements of the fighter interceptor squadron are for 14 aircraft to be combat ready and sheltered. Four aircraft will be placed in the alert hangar, leaving a requirement for sheltering an additional 10 aircraft. Failure to provide two shelters will result in a seriously degraded squadron combat capability. There are no ready aircraft shelters existing or programed for this base.

The third facility is required to house 11 T–38 flight simulators. This is a new requirement generated by change in mission aircraft from T–33 to T–38 type aircraft. The use of simulators increases pilot effectiveness in the preliminary phases of their training, reduces training time, and is more economical than operation of aircraft for this purpose.

The fourth item is required to provide a 20,000-pound thrust jet engine test stand, which is an essential accessory to the existing base aircraft engine inspection and repair shop. This stand is required to perform specified operating tests after minor overhauls, do required trouble shooting, and evaluate engines suspected of malfunction.

The last item is for a refueling vehicle shop needed to provide space for organizational and field maintenance of some 37 special purpose (refueling) vehicles assigned to this base. Safety requirements prohibit maintenance work of this type in the existing auto maintenance shop. At present, servicing and maintenance must be done in an open area. During periods of inclement weather, particularly dust storms which are prevalent in this area, it is impossible to properly service and maintain equipment. The refueling vehicles are now in short supply and this condition is aggravated with the assignment of tenant ADC fighter interceptors to the base. There are no structures available which could satisfy the requirements for this shop.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Lighting, approach	District engineer	$16	5
A/C shelter, ready	do	12	5
Flight simulator training	Unknown	15	5
Test stand, jet	District engineer	3	5
Shop, refueling vehicle	do	6	5

Mr. Sheppard. If you have a summary statement covering this situation give it to us now.

Colonel Parkhill. We have a total training program involving 14 bases. The price is $28,961,000.

I will call off high-cost projects and special-interest projects.

Brooks Air Force Base, School of Aviation Medicine, $8,555,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, officers quarters and dining hall, $734,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, recruit training and housing facility, $2,405,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, academic classroom and squadron headquarters, $617,000.

Keesler, technical training building, $2,430,000.

Mather, maintenance docks, SAC, $1,067,000.

Perrin, runway extension, with overruns, power check pad, $1,798,000.

Stead, dispensary, $320,000.

Other projects are as follows:

Airfield pavements at two locations, communications and navigation aids at two locations, runway and approach lights for five bases, operations mission training for three bases, various operational and training facilities for nine bases, engine inspection and repair shops for five bases, armament and electronics shops for three bases, ground-powered equipment shops for three bases, various maintenance facilities at five bases, dental clinic, one base, utilities at two bases, and real estate for one base.

BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now turn to Brooks Air Force Base.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	BROOKS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI NNW SAN ANTONIO	GOVT OWNED	1,331
COUNTY, STATE	BEXAR, TEX	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,331
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1917

PRINCIPAL MISSION

SCHOOL OF AVIATION MEDICINE

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
181	236	703	155	1,275		671

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 58 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
37,000	8,082	9,986	18,932	9,289	9,643

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
USAF SCHOOL AVN MED	157		685	547,510	298,953	248,557	174,700	SF	8,555
DINING HALL OFFICER	159		NEW	6,558		6,558	6,558	SF	256
OQ MEN	160		NEW	296	48	248	48	MN	478
									9,289

BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE

Brooks Air Force Base is located 6 miles south, southeast of San Antonio, Tex. The planned use of this base is for the School of Aviation Medicine. The program contains a request for $9,289,000 and comprises three items.

The first project is for five technical facilities and related support structures for the School of Aviation Medicine. This complex will provide the most urgently needed facilities for research into aeromedical problems of human responses, adaptations, effectiveness, and protection under conditions imposed by present and future weapon systems and space vehicles; complex will provide for basic medical and clinical research as well as teaching. This project does not duplicate any structures in being or under construction at any Federal or civilian agency.

The second item for an officers dining hall is needed to feed assigned student officers, on a strict schedule, with minimum interference to classroom work. Permanently assigned officers totaling 157 men and 161 high grade civilians will be furnished their needs in this facility. There are no facilities existing at this installation that can be used for this purpose and the item will satisfy 100 percent of the total base requirement.

The last item for 48 bachelor officers quarters is needed to house the student officers attending courses at the School of Aviation Medicine. While there are 183 spaces at this base, they are wholly inadequate and are scheduled for demolition. Adequate off-base housing is not available in the area, and the construction of the proposed quarters will meet only 30 percent of the total requirement. It is planned to enter into a phased program for the balance of officer housing requirements in future years programs.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
USAF School AVN MED	Unknown	$428	20
Dining Hall Officer	J Harris Hein	13	5
OQ Men	District engineer	24	5

Mr. SHEPPARD. You request $8,550,000 for a school of aviation medicine.

Colonel PARKHILL. We have Colonel Carmichael here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is a heavy requirement. Give us an explanation of it.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. By way of a brief review, the School of Aviation Medicine, located at Brooks Air Force Base, was proposed in a staff study in three increments. The first increment constituted approximately $9 million. It was constructed and occupied in July of 1959.

The first increment consisted of the academic building where we conduct primarily our officer training course, a research institute building, a flight medicine laboratory building, a shops building, and an altitude building, plus a powerplant. This partially satisfies enough of the requirement to allow the school to move from Randolph Air Force Base to Brooks.

The program you have before you today, sir, constitutes a portion of phase 2, or the addition to the research facility at Brooks Air Force Base to allow them to complete their mission in this area.

I might review briefly the mission of the school as read this morning into the record. It consists basically of teaching or training, research, and consultation.

Phase 1, as I just mentioned, takes care of the training phase. Phase 2 deals primarily with the research. In phase 2 we are requesting the following buildings included on page 2:

There is the bioastronautics building, a biodynamics building, a library, a professional building, and a bionucleonics laboratory, and a vivarium-support facility. That in the broadest highlight, sir, shows the items. I will be glad to go into detail.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the plans and the basis for cost estimates for this facility as of now?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Preliminary plans have been completed. We have the working drawings or the definitive drawings at the present time.

The cost estimate is based on the civilian architect and engineer estimates following the completion of the concept or the preliminary plans.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But they have not been definitized as yet?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Actually the preliminary plans constitute, and perhaps Colonel Edmonds would like to cover that, definitive drawings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next question obviously would be this: In the original plan, if they have gone in and segregated the plumbing costs, electrical requirements, feeder lines, and so on, is this a percentage estimate? About 90 percent of the preliminary plans concluded to this point without definitization are based on a percentage. Which has been done here?

General MINTON. Here it has been the estimate of the architect-engineer and not based on detailed drawings. Those estimates have been checked by the construction agency, I believe.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, I am not belaboring the point of having preliminary planning. I think we can agree that in those plans where actual pullouts have not been made there can be considerable slippage, both up and down.

General MINTON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And we therefore inherit many changeovers.

General MINTON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In a building of this type experience shows you can get slugged with many change orders.

General MINTON. We will not advertise this until we have completely detailed and definitized plans. The thing we may find is that this price may not be quite as good as I would like to have it. We will have this complete before it is advertised.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year the committee directed the Department of the Air Force and the Department of Defense to study the combining of aviation medicine and research facilities at a single location under a single head. Does this line item appear before us now based on that kind of a study having been made?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir. That study was made and furnished to the committee. This line item has been approved by the Office, Secretary of Defense, in consonance with their study.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How are you handling this work at the present time?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The research work at the present time is handled by a limited in-house capability and is severely limited by lack of laboratory facilities as evidenced by the program you see before you.

We are handling our current research in three ways basically. First it is by contract with civilian universities and civilian industry. Also we have in-house capability. We actually would propose to continue this same relationship.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Percentagewise that would be about 35 or 40 percent of your total?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. I will have to furnish that for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

At present, an average of 60 percent of the research at the School of Aviation Medicine is being conducted by contract. The remaining 40 percent is conducted by in-house capability.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You show a deficiency of 248,000 square feet of space for the School of Aviation Medicine. Yet you are constructing only 174,000 square feet. Why?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The 174,000 square feet, sir, is not the total scope in phase 2. The phase 2 consisted of $12 million authorization.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Colonel EDMONDS. 248,557 is the number of square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is a discrepancy as against the total requirements in the square footage requirement and the asked-for space.

Colonel EDMONDS. There are two buildings in phase 2 authorized which were not included in the appropriation bill.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The first one is the cellular physiology laboratory and the dental research facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then you plan additional increments in future years. Is that correct?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We plan on requesting the two buildings I just mentioned, the cellular physiology and dental research facility as far as technical buildings are concerned. That would complete phase 2. Those are the technical buildings.

There is a phase 3 which constitutes primarily the base support type items which are not involved in this phase 2 program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you get the record analyze this a little closer and give a more detailed response.

(The information requested follows:)

The detailed breakout of 248,557 square feet for technical buildings, libraries, and professional buildings for the School of Aviation Medicine was arrived at as follows:

	Square feet
Phase I: Constructed under authority granted by Public Laws 534 and 547, 83d Cong	256,410
Phase II: Authorized by Public Law 685, 85th Cong.:	
Bionucleonics laboratory	37,500
Bioastronautics laboratory	24,000
Cellular physiology laboratory	40,000
Biodynamics laboratory	13,000
Dental research laboratory	12,000
Vivarium support facility	34,600
Library and professional building	130,000
Total authorized by Public Law 685	291,100
Total requirements phase I and II	547,510
Less facilities constructed under phase I	256,410
Total	291,100

	Square feet.
Less usable substandard buildings (housing such activities as dental research laboratory, record repository, library, etc., to be replaced under authority granted by Public Law 685)	42,543
Deficiency recorded in fiscal year 1961 military construction program appropriations	248,557

However, the scope of 248,557 should be adjusted due to refinements and reductions in scope accomplished thus far in design. The total scope now required, versus the 291,100 authorized by Public Law 685, is estimated at 225,797 square feet with the following breakout.

Bionucleonics laboratory	37,089
Bioastronautics and biodynamics laboratories	39,920
Cellular physiology laboratory [1]	31,993
Professional building	48,249
Library	27,374
Dental research laboratory [1]	13,628
Vivarium support	27,544
Total	225,797

[1] Authorized in phase II, but not included in this appropriations bill.

The scope of 225,797 square feet is, in turn, subject to further minor refinement with development of final plans. This revised scope was not available in time to allow a change in the program prior to submission to the printer.

The total scope of 547,510 square feet represents the requirements of phase I and II only, that is, technical buildings, library and professional buildings. It does not include support facilities which will be programed in phase III. Facilities in phase III are normal base type support items.

The following explanation is offered with respect to operational procedures:

The School of Aviation Medicine conducts a comprehensive research program in the basic sciences in the various fields of military aero space medicine. These requirements are valid for many years to come not only by the challenge of space but also by the aero medical problems of conventional and jet aviation, many of which contain many unknown facets.

In addition to these are the demands for aerospace medical knowledge sufficient to guarantee the effectiveness of the human operator in advanced experimental aerospace craft, such as the X–15 and the DYNASOAR, both of which are active projects today.

The basic research embraces a broad spectrum of activities in a number of the life sciences, including the specialties in biology and physiology, as well as the basic fields of medicine and its supporting sciences.

In addition the Air Force continues its mission of evaluation of the biological effects of radiation. In conjunction with the AEC and other Federal agencies, the Air Force assumed responsibility for the primates. The continuation of the study of the chronic effects of radiation on the primate colony is a vital mission.

The research conducted at the School of Aviation Medicine, as noted in response to an earlier question concerning the Aero Space Medical Laboratory at Wright-Patterson AFB, is basic in nature as distinguished from the applied type research in direct support of a weapons system conducted at Wright-Patterson.

There are no facilities at any other Air Force installation capable of conducting the research mission assigned to the School of Aviation Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for dining hall and BOQ space at this location at the present time?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. At the present time we are using some converted barracks for BOQ's.

At the present time the officers are eating their noon meal in the officers open mess at Brooks which is an extremely deteriorated and outmoded building.

KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up Keesler Air Force Base, Miss.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	KEESLER AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI S BILOXI	GOVT OWNED	1,379
COUNTY, STATE	HARRISON, MISS	OTHER ACRES	140
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,519
COMMAND	ATC	DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	TECH TRNG CENTER U S COAST GUARD AIR/GROUND OPER SCH		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAF
998	351	14,471	3,335	19,155		2,707

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
99,000	69,267	17,883	11,850	2,499	9,351

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
FIRE STA.COMBINATION ADDN	484		NEW	11,772	3,492	8,280	4,100	SF	69
TRAINING,TECHNICAL	I		NEW	254,697	144,697	110,000	110,000	SF	2,430
									2,499

KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE

Keesler Air Force Base is located 1 mile north of Biloxi, Miss. The planned use is for a technical training center. The program requested for this base is $2,499,000 and involves two items.

The first item is for a combination fire station of five stalls to be added to the existing two-stall structure. There is an existing three-stall crash station which was built in 1942, but it has deteriorated to such an extent that it is beyond economical repair due to dry rot and termite damage, and is scheduled for demolition.

The other item requested in this program is for a technical training building to support maintenance and operational training in electronic data processing, digital and analog computer work, and related career area. This two story, concrete, windowless, air-conditioned structure will house 88 laboratories equipped with about $3 million worth of special training devices now located at IBM plant at Kingston, N.Y. In addition, it will house fabricated synthetic trainers manufactured at Keesler and additional electronic data processing equipment from Air Force assets. This facility, together with the existing buildings, will satisfy the total requirement at this installation for this specialized structure.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Fire station combination ADDN	District engineer	$3	5
Training, technical	do	122	2

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the need for a special training facility for maintenance and operator training in electronic data processing at this base?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. Basically the need arises out of the fact we have these special courses which are just coming into being. These courses will provide the training for the airmen and officers who will man such things as our SAGE system, SAC-control system and so on.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are are other services and other governmental agencies doing for this type of training, if you know?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. I cannot answer directly, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there anyone here who can answer that question insofar as checking out these operations to be sure there is no duplication?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. I could answer it partially in this way, sir: The systems we are talking about for training are purely Air Force type systems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no other requirement of like character other than that contained within the Air Force?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. I could not say that positively.

General MINTON. That is perhaps true but we had better check it, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The technical training facility at Keesler Air Force Base will provide space for the training of personnel who will operate and maintain Air Force systems such as SAGE, BMEWS, SAC control system, Quick Globe, and others. Separate courses and different training will be established for each system. Although the other services may conduct training for systems utilizing electronic data processing equipment, they would not have the capability to train for systems which are unique to the Air Force. Conversely, the Air Force would not have the capability to train for systems which are unique to the other services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary to locate this training at this Air Force Base instead of at some other location where existing facilities are available?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. First of all, they are not available. We do check that out. The training is being conducted at Keesler primarily because that is our electronics training center. This is our traditional electronics technical training center.

LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., is the next project to be considered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	LACKLAND AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIS TO TOWN	8 MI ENE SAN ANTONIO	GOVT OWNED	2,777
COUNTY, STATE	BEXAR, TEX	OTHER ACRES	41
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,818
COMMAND	ATC	DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	USAF BASIC MIL SCH TECH SCH OFFICER CANDIDATE SCH PRE-FLIGHT TRNG SCH MARKSMANSHIP TRNG SCH		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,226	251	6,619	21,424	29,520		2,120

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 19 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
75,000	56,059	5,873	13,068	3,022	10,046

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ACADEMIC,CLASSROOM	ACMD	146		NEW				127,004	SF	550
HEADQUARTERS,SQ.		153		NEW	107,737	93,737	14,000	2,800	SF	67
RECRUIT TNG&HSG FAC		154		NEW	24,697	20,425	4,272	1,040	MN	2,405
										3,022

LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE

Lackland AFB is located 8 miles east-northeast of San Antonio, Tex. The planned use is for a basic military, technical, and precommission officer training school. The program requested for this base totals $3,022,000 and contains three projects as follows:

The first item is for modification of air conditioning in four existing academic classroom buildings to replace the present cooling system which uses four mechanical ventilating fans in each structure. The high temperature and excessive humidity in this area during the summer months reaching an average peak of 96°, with 69 percent humidity, makes it imperative to provide dependable, year-round air conditioning for both students and instructors. These 112 classrooms are occupied by approximately 3,000 students daily. The training is conducted using a maximum of training aids such as training films, film strips, complex mechanical and electronic devices, and television, which increase the room temperature.

The second item for a squadron headquarters building is needed to provide minimum essential administrative supply and issue space for the 1,040 personnel who will be housed in the recruit training and housing facility requested elsewhere in this program. It will be used by the squadron commander and administrative personnel responsible for morning reports, payrolls, mail, and duty rosters, and storage space for issue of squadron equipment, blankets, sheets, cots, and housekeeping type items. There are no facilities in the proposed area of the troop housing which can be made available for use as squadron headquarters.

The last item requested in this program is needed to provide recruit training and housing for 1,040 men at this base. The five units each with a capacity of 208 men each, will be of special design for use in the basic military training program to provide housing and training areas, as an integrated facility. There are existing at this base a total of 20,425 housing spaces with a requirement for 24,697.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Academic, classroom	District Engineer	$29	5
Headquarters, squadron	Addis E. Noonan Associates and Jerry Rogers	5	5
Recruit training and housing facility	do	121	5

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why were not the four academic classroom buildings air conditioned when they were constructed?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. They do have air conditioning of a sort but it is not sufficient.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is merely to modernize your air conditioning as against what it was?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. That is correct.

Colonel PARKHILL. We found by experience that in these buildings which are permanent buildings, and certainly worth improving, that in the hot summer months the problem is very difficult with the mechanical operation. We feel this is necessary in terms of efficiency in training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Today we have a procedure where air conditioning is permissible in certain areas. Am I right in assuming that in the modern concept of construction wherever it is permissible we build air conditioning?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We do not take a chance on something happening there.

General MINTON. That is correct, and there is another step. Perhaps there are some places where we do not have money to do air conditioning at the present time but we will design the heating system, generally a hot-air heating system, with ducts of a certain size so that in the future if possible we can air condition merely by putting in the equipment and not tearing down the building.

The difference in size between a heating duct and an air-conditioning duct is merely a few square inches.

MATHER AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up Mather Air Force Base, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	MATHER AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	12 MI SWS SACRAMENTO	GOVT OWNED	6,120
COUNTY, STATE	SACRAMENTO, CALIF	OTHER ACRES	1
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	6,121
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1918
PRINCIPAL MISSION	NAVIGATION TRNG SCH HVY BOMB SQ (SAC) HVY REFUEL SQ (SAC) RADAR SQ (SAGE) (ADC) GAM-77 MSLES		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
2,001	215	4,272	28	6,516		1,221

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
87,000	56,291	18,157	12,552	2,963	9,589

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
LIGHTING R/W NG&CL		145		NEW					LS	400	
ELEC WARFARE LAB		147		NEW	28,006		28,006	28,006	SF	867	
OPER.MISSION TNG.		I	SAC	NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	99	
SHOP A/C ENG. I&R		I	SAC	149	18,970		18,970	18,970	SF	269	R
MAINT.DOCK,LARGE A/C		I	SAC	NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	1,067	
SHOP ARM&ELECT.	ADDN	354	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	122	
SHOP GROUND POW.EQ.		30	SAC	149	5,278		5,278	5,278	SF	139	R
										2,963	

Mather Air Force Base

Mather Air Force Base is located 12 miles east of Sacramento, Calif. The planned use of this base is for navigator training and a Strategic Air Command bomber mission. The program requested for Mather Air Force Base totals $2,963,000 and involves seven items as follows:

The first item for lighting runway, narrow gage and centerline, is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required at bases chosen as an area "safe haven" for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely bad weather conditions. It consists of a system of high intensity lights embedded 30 feet from and parallel to the centerline of the runway for the first 3,200 feet, in the landing zone. From this point, smaller lights are embedded at regular intervals along the runway centerline for the remainder of the runway, to allow for accurate directional control and deceleration.

The second item for electronic warfare laboratory is required to support four electronic warfare officer (EWO) courses having a combined student load of 374 officers. The officers from SAC, TAC, and oversea commands are trained in bomber defense and electronic reconnaissance in this facility and include instruction in the potential enemy interceptor, guided missile, and electronically controlled gun-battery defenses. Graduates are also used by ADC in countering the EWO activities of approaching bombers. Mather is the only acceptable base containing an existing 11,300-foot runway adequate to support the established requirement for a large jet EWO trainer.

The third project provides for an operational mission training required to house the training instruments and devices scheduled for Mather. The complex aircraft and equipment now in use necessitates training of both operational and maintenance personnel. Training devices have proven most beneficial and economical when crews change to new weapons systems. Their use prior to actual flight enhances flying safety through insuring knowledge of normal and emergency procedures.

The fourth item provides for an aircraft engine inspection and repair shop. This building is required to provide covered facility for accomplishment of B–52 and KC–135 jet engine minor repair and engine buildup of all aircraft assigned to this base in support of SAC mission. This facility is required for dispersed maintenance concept.

The fifth item provides for two additional aircraft maintenance docks to accommodate large SAC aircraft. Prior to fiscal year 1960, adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item is for an addition to the existing armament and electronic shop to provide additional storage and maintenance space required by the expanding and more complex electronic equipment installed in SAC heavy bomber aircraft. When this facility is constructed, it will satisfy the total requirement for this base.

The last item is required to provide space for maintenance and servicing approximately 227 pieces of ground powered equipment used in the servicing of B–52 and KC–135 SAC aircraft.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting runway, narrow gage and centerline.	District engineer	$20	5
Electronic Warfare Laboratory	do	55	2
Operational vission training	do	8	2
Shop, aircraft engine, inspection and repair.	Falk & Booth	14	90
Maintenance dock, large aircraft	AMC	53	100
Shop, armament and electronics	District engineer	10	5
Shop, ground powered equipment	Falk & Booth	7	90

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you doing for electronics warfare training at the present time?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. The training is now being done at Keesler Air Force Base which is the electronics warfare training center.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you contemplate that this facility could not be put at some other military installation where existing facilities are available?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. We have not been able to locate any other facilities. This is a rather specialized type of building. We do not have other facilities available for this type of training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You must have had some reason for moving from Keesler to Mather. What was the reason for that? Were you congested there?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. That is one reason. There are several others.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are they?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. In addition to the congestion at Keesler, (which by the way is, next to Lackland, is our most heavily populated technical training base), there is a runway problem at Keesler. They have difficulty getting their aircraft off the ground down there now under hot conditions. They use C–54 and C–29 aircraft and they have some problem with takeoffs.

This is a flying training function on a technical training base. That, then, is another reason why we would like to move it—to provide a location that is more in keeping with the mission.

PERRIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next we have Perrin Air Force Base, Tex.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY — 1961

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	PERRIN AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI SSE SHERMAN	GOVT OWNED	1,769
COUNTY, STATE	GRAYSON, TEX	OTHER ACRES	2,288
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,057
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION FLY TRNG SCH (ADV INTERCEPTOR)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
422	3	1,972	7	2,404		974

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
32,000	19,178	4,650	8,172	3,654	4,518

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY,PRIM/INSTRUMT	EXTD	136		NEW	166,667	133,333	33,334	16,667	SY	1,402
RUNWAY,OVERRUNS		137		NEW	66,667	33,333	33,334	16,667	SY	199
PAD,POWER CHECK		478		NEW	8,448		8,448	4,224	SY	197
GRND CONTROL INTER.	ADDN	479		NEW	9,887	4,293	5,594	5,594	SF	173
LIGHTING,APPROACH	DFRP	138		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	288
HIGH ALTITUDE TNG		139		NEW	7,200		7,200	7,200	SF	191
SHOP,A/C ENG I&REPR		480		NEW	31,838		31,838	31,838	SF	617
TEST STAND,JET		140		NEW	2	1	1	1	EA	25
SHOP,PARA&DINGHY,BSE	DFRP	481		NEW	9,160		9,160	7,040	SF	184
ELEC.A/C OUTLETS		482		NEW	90		60	60	EA	278
LAND,FEE PURCHASE		141		NEW				109.000	AC	35
LAND,EASEMENT CLEAR		142		NEW				579.000	AC	65
										3,654

Perrin Air Force Base

Perrin Air Force Base is located 5 miles northwest of Sherman, Tex. This base is utilized for fighter interceptor combat crew training. The program requested for Perrin amounts to $3,654,000 and comprises 12 items as follows:

The first item, a 1,000- by 150-foot wide extension of the existing 8,000-foot instrument runway is required in support of F–102 fighter interceptor aircraft being assigned this base in the first quarter, fiscal year 1961. A runway length of 9,000 feet is required for this aircraft.

The next item is a 150- by 1,000-foot runway overrun on the north approach zone of the instrument runment.

The four power check pads requested in the next project are needed to perform full power check on jet aircraft. These checks are accomplished after every 10 to 25 hours of flying and should be performed on the apron due to the high decibel noise level they create. The area presently being used for full power checks is an old, inactive runway, without the required 360° tiedown capability which is essential in the checking of F–102 type aircraft. This area will be used for parking of F–86 aircraft remaining on the base.

The addition to the ground control intercept facility is required to provide additional space for FAA activities and for classroom space for the advanced controller's course. FAA will have exclusive occupancy of 2,212 square feet in the combined facility. The operations room in the new facility will be jointly used by the FAA and the Air Force.

The next item is for a 3,000-foot approach lighting system on the north end of the primary instrument runway. The existing unusable overrun area lighting system will be salvaged.

The next item is for a high altitude training building in which students will be trained in use of equipment utilized when flying at extreme altitudes, and for training technicians and maintenance personnel in fitting, adjusting and making minor repairs on oxygen masks and helmets.

The following item for an engine inspection and repair shop is required for handling and maintaining J–57 jet type engines. The J–33 and J–47 engines are presently being maintained in a makeshift base maintenance shop which lacks monorails, hoists, and other shop facilities essential in handling the larger and heavier jet engines.

The next item for construction of a 36,000-pound jet thrust stand is required to service jet engines prior to their installation in the F–102 aircraft. The existing jet stand can only test up to 20,000-pound thrust, and will be used to perform tests on engines of the T–33 and F–86 aircraft.

The next item for replacement of the exitsing 3,696 square feet unusable parachute and dinghy shop is needed to service F–102 drag chutes for safety of operation. These chutes cannot be serviced in the existing shop because of space limitations and poor condition of existing building. An average of 478 drag chute landings are made each month, with a peak load runing to 660. The existing building will be demolished upon completion of the new facility. No other space is available at the base which can satisfy the requirement.

The next item for aircraft electrification support is required to operate electric motor driven ground support equipment servicing aircraft during routine line maintenance. The requested power outlets will, when completed, satisfy the total base requirements.

The next two items for land fee purchase of 109 acres and 579 acres of land easement clearance is needed in connection with the 1,000-foot runway extension, overrun and approach lights for the north-south runway at this installation. The easement is for the purpose of removing hazards from the glide path in the south approach zone.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, primary instrument extended.	District engineer	70	5
Runway, overruns	do	10	5
Pad, power check	do	11	5
Ground control intercept addition	do	9	5
Lighting, approach DFRP	do	14	5
High altitude training	do	10	5
Shop, A/C engine inspection and repair.	do	31	5
Test stand, jet	do	3	5
Shop, parachute and dinghy, base DFRP.	do	10	5
Electrification, A/C outlets	do	14	5

Mr. SHEPPARD. How firm is your requirement to place F–102 aircraft at this installation?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. That is extremely firm. Aircraft will start arriving there during the first quarter of fiscal year 1961.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is it necessary to locate the training for this aircraft at this base where the facilities are immediately inadequate instead of at other locations where adequate facilities exist?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. This is a conversion of aircraft. The training is there now. They are using other types of aircraft. We are simply changing the aircraft. We are getting more modern aircraft which is in keeping with our desire to give advance flying training in as close to actual tactical aircraft as we can.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where will you handle training for other advanced fighter interceptors, such as the F–106?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. All of the Air Training Command fighter interceptor training will be done at this location. They transition to other type aircraft after being assigned to tactical units.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of land acquisition required for this runway extension?

Colonel PARKHILL. It is agricultural and grazing land, 109 acres in fee. Total cost is $35,000. The easement clearance is for 579 acres, total cost of $65,000.

This is based on a real estate planning report by the district engineer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you say agricultural land in the State of Texas, what kind of definition do you apply to the word "agricultural"?

Mr. GIBBENS. This is primarily grazing land, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pretty expensive for grazing land, is it not?

Mr. GIBBENS. The note I have here states there is an oilfield in this vicinity although no drilling is being done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume in purchasing that the best you are getting are the surface rights?

Mr. GIBBENS. I would say so at this cost, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If this is already oil-producing land, even though they are not pumping at the moment, and you are paying that money per acre, you are getting nothing but surface rights?

Mr. GIBBENS. I think that is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you can buy developed oilfields for this money let me know.

Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I right in assuming that so far as control of elevations are concerned you have no authority beyond your easement extension?

General MINTON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Here you are setting over an oilfield they can start up tomorrow morning if they so desire. Is that correct?

General MINTON. I notice now we have a certain amount of this land for easement, clearance easement on the runway extension, and I have not looked at this layout myself. I must assume that that easement is for that purpose, to prevent construction of oil derricks within the natural fly path that we have. That is the way it will be done, I am sure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you were taking the end of the runway, and I will draw this for you, we are coming to this point for an easement to protect ourselves.

The elevation potential is beyond your control, anyway. The only way you can control that is by this extension.

General MINTON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going far enough beyond the present end line of the runway to thoroughly protect yourself?

General MINTON. That is the normal way we acquire easements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have not heretofore been into an oilfield operation to this degree?

General MINTON. No, but we would acquire the easement to the end of the runway so that any oil derrick constructed would be outside the easement and it would be far enough away from the end of the runway so there would be no problem.

I will look this up.

(The information requested follows:)

Acquisition of the clearance easements programed in the fiscal year 1961 military construction program for Perrin Air Force Base, Tex., will enable restriction of height on all structures and objects, including oil derricks; as may be necessary to provide a 1:50 glidepath.

SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, we come to Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	SHEPPARD AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI S WICHITA FALLS	GOVT OWNED	3,820
COUNTY, STATE	WICHITA, TEX	OTHER ACRES	65
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,885
COMMAND	ATC		
		DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	TECH TRNG CENTER HVY BOMB SQ (SAC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
879	71	11,864	1,359	14,173		2,408

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
98,000	44,675	42,084	11,241	1,532	9,709

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
WASHRACK,AIRCRAFT		328	SAC	NEW	4,540		4,540	4,540	SY	210	
COMM.,BASE	DFRP	143		149	7,532	3,953	3,579	7,532	SF	156	
LIGHTING APPROACH		336	SAC	NEW	4,500	3,000	1,500	1,500	FT	113	
OPER.MISSION TNG.		I	SAC	NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	59	
SHOP A/C MAINT FIELD	ADDN	I	SAC	149	56,700	40,480	16,220	8,000	SF	175	R
SHOP A/C ENG I&R		I	SAC	149	18,970		18,970	18,970	SF	273	R
SHOP ARM &ELECT.	ADDN	355	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	129	
DENTAL CLINIC	DFRP	151		NEW	13,211	9,840	3,371	13,211	SF	417	
										1,532	

Sheppard Air Force Base

Sheppard Air Force Base is the next location to be considered. It is situated 3 miles north of Wichita Falls, Tex. The planned use of this base is for technical training and for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber unit. The program requested amounts to $1,532,000 and comprises eight items, as follows:

(*a*) The first item for an aircraft washrack is required to perform effective maintenance on SAC heavy bomber aircraft. No facilities exist on the base that can be utilized for this purpose.

(*b*) The second project is for the base communications building. The existing building is a World War II wood frame building inadequate in size and layout to accommodate the increased load due to the addition of the SAC mission to the existing mission.

(*c*) The third item is for approach lighting for the SAC heavy bomber mission. The centerline system of approach lighting for the SAC heavy bomber mission. The centerline system of approach lighting is an essential operational requirement for all types of modern high-speed military aircraft. The current U.S. standard lighting approach system provides the necessary visual coupler for safe and efficient operation. Lack of this facility will adversely affect the mission capability of the base and compromise safety.

(*d*) The fourth item is for a 2,200-square-foot operational mission training facility for SAC, required to house training equipment and devices. The complex aircraft and equipment now in use, necessitate continuous training of both operational and maintenance personnel.

(*e*) The next item is for an addition to the aircraft field maintenance shop. This project is required to provide additional space to meet SAC operational mission requirement for field maintenance under dispersed maintenance concept.

(*f*) The sixth project is for an aircraft engine inspection and repair shop to support the SAC mission requirement, under the dispersed maintenance concept.

(*g*) The seventh item is for an addition to the existing armament and electronic shop to provide additional storage and maintenance space required by the expanding and more complex electronic equipment installed in the SAC heavy-bomber-type aircraft. The completion of this facility will satisfy total base requirements.

(*h*) The last item required is for a 30-dental-operating-unit building. The two structures presently used for dental service were built in 1942. Foundations have settled to a point where windows and doors no longer fit properly, which allows dust to infiltrate into the operating rooms. Floors need extensive replacement and the buildings are generally in a rundown condition. Rehabilitation of these obsolete structures is not advisable from an economic and engineering standpoint, and they will be disposed of. A total of 32 operating rooms are required to serve a population of 13,908 SAC and Air Training Command military population. Two of the operating rooms will be in the new composite medical facility requested in the fiscal year 1960 military construction program.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Washrack, aircraft	Unknown	$11	5
Comm., base	District engineer	16	20
Lighting approach	do	10	5
Oper. mission tng	Unknown	6	5
Shop A/C maint. field addn	Carter & Burgess	13	100
Shop A/C Engr. I & R	do	21	100
Shop arm & elect	Unknown	10	5
Dental clinic	do	29	5

Mr. Sheppard. You requested a composite medical facility at this installation in the fiscal year 1960 program. Why did you not make adequate provisions for the dental chairs in that building rather than requesting the construction of a clinic?

Colonel Carmichael. There was a prior authorized item here and it was under design prior to the 1960 program. When it was originally authorized it did not include the dental clinic.

The dental clinic is currently being designed as an integral part of the composite medical facility. Therefore when it is constructed it will be, assuming this clears this program, constructed as part of the composite medical facility. It is being designed so it would be compatible.

MOODY AIR FORCE BASE, GA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up next Moody Air Force Base, Ga.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	MOODY AFB
DIR TO TOWN	10 MI SW VALDOSTA
COUNTY, STATE	LOWNDES, LANIER GA
COUNTRY	
COMMAND	ATC
PRINCIPAL MISSION	BASIC PILOT TRNG PRIMARY PILOT TRNG

GOVT LEASED	
GOVT OWNED	1,555
OTHER ACRES	79
TOTAL ACRES	1,634
DATE OCC	1941

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
345	10	1908	15	2,278		669

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
24,000	17,000		7,000	1,389	5,611

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRNG	207		NEW	12,500		12,500	12,500	SF	301
SHOP, A/C ENG I&R	435		NEW	42,000		42,000	31,838	SF	488
SHOP, AUTO MAINT	531		NEW	26,999	9,441	17,558	13,816	SF	240
SHOP, REFUEL VEH	436		NEW	3,516		3,516	3,516	SF	90
SHOP, GRND POWER EQUIP	437		NEW	4,574		4,574	4,574	SF	95
SHOP, PARA & DINGHY	438		NEW	5,705		5,705	5,705	SF	175
									1,389

MOODY AIR FORCE BASE, GA.

Moody Air Force Base is located 10 miles northeast of Valdosta, Ga. This base is utilized for basic and primary pilot training. The program request for Moody amounts to $1,389,000 and comprises six items as follows:

The first item is to house 11 T–38 flight simulators which is a new mission requirement imposed by change of mission aircraft to T–38 type aircraft. The use of flight simulators increase the effectiveness of personnel in the preliminary phases of pilot training, reduces training time, and has proven more economical than use of aircraft for this purpose. No facilities exist or can be converted to house these training facilities.

The second item is for an aircraft engine inspection and repair shop. Requirement for this facility is generated by a change in mission and assignment of T–37 and T–38 aircraft both of which have two jet engines. An interim inspection and repair shop has been set up in a field maintenance hangar, but this facility is inadequate in size and physical arrangement to provide proper base and depot level maintenance. Furthermore, this hangar is required as an aircraft maintenance facility.

The third project is for an auto maintenance shop. The requirement for this shop is based upon vehicle equivalents of 618 units. Five of the existing buildings, ranging in size from 1,481 to 4,341 square feet, have deteriorated beyond a point of economical recovery. Operation of small facilities such as these is expensive and not conductive of high-level maintenance.

The fourth item is a refueling vehicle shop for inspection and maintenance of 33 refueling vehicles. No existing facility is adaptable for this special-type maintenance.

The fifth project is a shop facility for inspection, repair, and servicing 300 units of ground-powered equipment. This specialized equipment which is used to support mission aircraft requires covered space for frequent inspection and servicing. No existing facility is adaptable for this purpose.

The last item is a parachute facility for washing, drying, repairing and temporary storage of parachutes. An eixsting World War II MOB facility built in 1941 is so badly deteriorated and termite infested as to be practically useless.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Flight simulator training	Unknown	$15	0
Shop, aircraft engine inspection and repair.	do	25	0
Shop, auto maintenance	do	12	0
Shop, refuel vehicles	do	5	0
Shop, ground powered equipment	do	5	0
Shop, parachute and dinghy	do	9	0

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it to be assumed that Moody will be a permanent base?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. Yes, sir, as far as the Air Force is concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the decision as to permanancy has been made at a high enough level so you can assure us there is no chance of a fallout here?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you checked into that, General?

General MINTON. I would like to check it further.

(The information requested follows:)

Based on our current and projected pilot training program, the Air Force has a firm requirement for the utilization of Moody Air Force Base. The present flying training base structure is being realined to provide for consolidated primary basic flying schools. Moody Air Force Base is one of the six bases that

have been selected. The conversion of aircraft and the phase-in of the revised mission is planned to take place during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1961. This decision has been approved by the Secretary of the Air Force.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall turn to the Air University and insert page 310 in the record at this point.

(The page follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Gunter Air Force Base	AU	$1,957
Maxwell Air Force Base	AU	5,318
Total		7,275

NOTE.—Revised April 11, 1960.

GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE, ALA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Pick up Gunter Air Force Base, Ala.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	GUNTER AFB	GOVT LEASED	817
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI WSW MONTGOMERY	GOVT OWNED	348
COUNTY, STATE	MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA	OTHER ACRES	15
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,180
COMMAND	AU		
		DATE OCC	1940
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FLD PRINTING PLANT USAF EXTENSION COURSE INSTITUTE MONTGOMERY AIR DEF SECTOR (ADC) SCHOOL AV MED (ATC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
265	590	997	1,725	3,577		735

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
28,000	18,173	5,025	4,802	1,957	2,845

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TRAINING AIDS SHOP	492		NEW	10,100		10,100	10,100	SF	260
HQS. WING	439	ADC	149	14,813		14,813	14,813	SF	281
DORMITORY A/M	493		149	2,224	400	1,824	600	MN	1,128
OQ MEN	495		NEW	643	88	555	40	MN	288
									1,957

GUNTER AIR FORCE BASE

Gunter Air Force Base is located approximately 6 miles northeast of Montgomery, Ala. Its planned use is for the School of Aviation Medicine, a field printing plant, extension courses, and Air Defense Command and SAGE mission. The program being requested at Gunter Air Force Base amounts to $1,957,000.

The first item will provide workshop space for the preparation and repair of training aids and graphics used in connection with the Medical Service School. This function is currently housed in a family housing unit, in part of the group headquarters building, in part of a warehouse, and storage space is each academy building. The requested 10,000 square feet will centralize all activity in one structure and adequately fulfill the requirement for this type of function.

The next item is a headquarters wing facility required to provide administrative space for the ADC mission at this base.

The next item is for a dormitory, airmen. This item will provide for a 600-man dormitory and partially relieve the present 1,824-man deficiency in dormitory spaces at this base. The present requirement is for 2,224 dormitory spaces, and there exists only 400 adequate standard spaces and 842 inadequate spaces at this base.

The next item will provide quarters for bachelor officers assigned to Gunter Air Force Base. The requirement for OQ's is 643 spaces. Only 88 spaces exist to meet this requirement. This request for 40 spaces will provide an increment toward satisfying the overall deficiency.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Training aids shop	District engineer	$15	0
Headquarters, wing	Pearson, Tittle & Narrows	23	90
Dormitory, airmen	District engineer	7	100
Officers quarters, men	do	12	50

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the SAGE direction center at this location?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is operational now. It is supporting the tests conducted at Eglin, which are fully operational.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the air defense mission here be affected in any way by the recently revised program?

General MINTON. I do not believe so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you find it necessary to locate a school of aviation medicine here instead of at Brooks Air Force Base?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The medical training conducted at Gunter Air Force Base is actually the U.S. Air Force Medical Field Service School. In other words, we conduct our technician training at Gunter Air Force and it has been established and been conducted there for a number of years.

The training conducted at Brooks Air Force Base at the School of Aviation Medicine is primarily the officer training course, officer-type course, in which we use the instructors who are engaged in all present missions—research, teaching, and consultation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many personnel are assigned at the School of Aviation Medicine at this location?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. I had better furnish that for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

The presently assigned medical strength at Gunter AFB is as follows:

	Officers	Airmen	Civilians	Total
Permanent party	120	250	97	467
Current student load/day	160	650		810
Total	280	900	97	1,277

NOTE.—As concerns students, this is the low cycle which will increase about mid-June when newly commissioned officers graduate from medical schools and universities and airmen are transferred from other bases.

The total programed medical strength at Gunter AFB by fiscal year is as follows:

	Officers	Airmen	Civilians	Total
Fiscal year 1961:				
Permanent party	109	241	97	447
Peak student load/day	481	1,050		1,531
Total	590	1,291	97	1,978
Fiscal year 1962:				
Permanent party	105	237	97	439
Peak student load/day	481	1,050		1,531
Total	586	1,287	97	1,970
Fiscal year 1963:				
Permanent party	105	237	97	439
Peak student load/day	420	1,050		1,470
Total	525	1,287	97	1,909

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to rehabilitating existing barracks bases here?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We have given a great deal of consideration to it. Actually with the SAGE operation being located at Gunter Air Force Base it has been necessary to transfer buildings from the School of Aviation Medicine to the SAGE operation. Therefore we have continually lost buildings from the school control and from the school availability. We have no buildings we can convert for this purpose.

MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION MAXWELL AFB
DIR TO TOWN 1 MI ESE MONTGOMERY
COUNTY, STATE MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA
COUNTRY
COMMAND AU

GOVT LEASED 68
GOVT OWNED 2,423
OTHER ACRES 819
TOTAL ACRES 3,310

DATE OCC 1918

PRINCIPAL MISSION

HQ AIR UNIVERSITY COMMAND
AIR WAR COLLEGE
COMMAND AND STAFF SCHOOL
ACADEMIC INSTRUCTORS SCHOOL
SQUADRON OFFICERS SCHOOL
WARFARE SYSTEM SCHOOL

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	AAF
1,628	1,561	2,439	110	5,738		729

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
60,000	45,365	2,390	12,245	5,318	6,927

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ILS		155		149					LS	130
LIGHTING APPROACH	DFRP	156		NEW	3,000	1,500	1,500	3,000	FT	166
WEATHER FACILITY		491		NEW					LS	166
COMP. MED. FAC.	DFRP	158		NEW	143,245	119,775	23,470	143,245	SF	3,997
DORMITORY AIRMEN		494		NEW	1,390	973	417	200	MN	428
OQ, MEN		532		NEW	1,108	598	510	48	MN	431
										5,318

Maxwell Air Force Base

Maxwell Air Force Base is located approximately 1 mile west of Montgomery, Ala. Its planned use is for the Air University Headquarters, Air War College, Air Command and Staff School, Research Studies Institute. The program requested at Maxwell AFB involves six items amounting to $5,318,000 as follows:

The first item is an ILS facility, that is required to provide approach and landing information in connection with the operation of the air field.

The next item provides for conversion of the existing 1,500-foot substandard approach lighting system and a 1,500-foot extension to provide a complete 3,000-foot standard system with sequence flashing lights. This improved system is an essential operational requirement for modern high-speed military aircraft.

The next item is a weather facility. The project is required to support installation of wind measuring set, temperature-humidity set, radar cloud height measuring set and transmitter meter.

The next item is a composite medical facility. This facility is required to provide adequate medical support for the Montgomery complex and provide certain special services for other Air Force bases in the Southeast United States. The existing facility was originally constructed as a 50-bed hospital in 1931 and progressively expanded in 26 buildings to the present 393-bed capacity. It is in extremely substandard condition characterized by the fact that the 393 beds and related medical functions are crowded into 119,775 square feet of space equivalent to a 200-bed facility, over dispersal (26 buildings), nonfireproofing construction and congested buildings and a poor functional arrangement in antiquated main structures and improvised converted facilities. The structures have also experienced extensive termite damage.

The next item is an airmen dormitory. The project is required to provide adequate housing for assigned airmen. Only four permanent buildings with a capacity of 516 spaces exist at this base to meet a requirement of 1,390 spaces. Seventeen temporary World War II buildings with a capacity of 629 spaces have deteriorated beyond economical repair and their use for housing must be discontinued.

The last item is for officers quarters. The requirement at Maxwell is for 1,108 spaces. Only 598 permanent spaces exist to satisfy this requirement. Additional OQ's are urgently required to house the permanently assigned officers, transient personnel, and students attending the various schools. In addition to the usual transient type personnel, quarters must be provided at Maxwell for many special visitors, such as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary of the Air Force, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, distinguished educators, and members of the Government who are concerned with the Air Force's educational program and other activities conducted at Maxwell.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
ILS	District engineer	$6.5	20
Lighting approach	do	10.0	10
Weather facility	do	8.3	10
Composite medical facility	do	190.0	0
Dormitory, airmen	do	12.0	60
OQ, men	do	12.0	0

Mr. Sheppard. What are you using for existing dental facilities at the present time?

Colonel Carmichael. It is a temporary dental clinic of World War II type. It is the same as the balance of the medical facilities.

Mr. Sheppard. What is the basis for the cost estimate for this facility?

Colonel Carmichael. Cost estimates used for the composite medical facility at Maxwell Air Force Base are an average of the Hill-Burton costs of facilities of comparable size to which we have applied the

geographical factor for the area. That is for the building to the 5-foot line.

To that we add the utilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with the existing facility if the new one is funded?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We will have no medical requirement except for building 714, which is now called the main hospital building, and which was built back in 1930. It was originally a 50-bed plan and will be converted to an airmen's dormitory for approximately 175 hospital personnel and will include space for squadron administration and dayroom. This is the squadron-type supply and squadron-type administration for the unit itself and should not be associated with the composite medical facility requirements.

Building 711, hospital administration, will be converted to an OQ nurses' quarter to provide housing for approximately 16 nurses.

Building 712, hospital dining hall, will be redesignated for use as a restaurant, public. All other existing facilities will be disposed of under the provisions of AFR 87–4, which is our disposal regulation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How will the maintenance costs of the present facilities compare with those anticipated for the new ones?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. May I clarify one thing for the record, sir, before I start to work on that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Good.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. I would like to make sure we are talking about comparable maintenance costs, in that in the present facility we will not have some of the medical equipment and some of the mechanical equipment that we will have in the new facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it should be broken down on a comparable basis in order to answer the question.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If we want to use your answer on a capital investment basis, that is one thing, but break it down on a comparable basis, one with the other. That is the way to give it to us. Otherwise, we would have a pileup that would not be too good, percentagewise.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir. We will try to break it down structurally and by type. I will furnish that for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

(The information requested follows:)

A thorough exploration of various accounting records fails to reveal maintenance figures which are sufficiently detailed to provide significant cost comparisons. A cost comparison of maintenance expense between an old and new facility with any degree of significance is unattainable since:

1. The type of medical care furnished under the concept of modern medicine requires more complex and complicated mechanical equipment, both medical and nonmedical. This, in turn, requires increased maintenance costs for the payment of qualified maintenance technicians and replacement parts for the equipment. These maintenance charges were nonexistent in the old cantonment type facilities. By the same token, the safety features for the patient and the extent of the medical care capability are limited in an old facilitity.

2. Maintenance of the old facilities serves only to "patch up" and "make do," without providing a more professionally adequate building or an increase in the extent of medical services available. This results in spending a disproportionate share of the funds available on obsolete facilities and serves only as a stopgap measure, whereas maintenance expenditures in new facilities are generated by new requirements for upkeep of a modern plant.

3. Attempting to compare maintenance costs of new and old facilities is similar to attempting to compare costs of maintaining a World War II B–17 bomber and the costs of maintaining a modern B–52 bomber. The costs are different and not comparable, since the items and capabilities are different.

Gross figures available indicate the following comparative maintenance costs for Maxwell Air Force Base and a recently constructed similar size facility at Carswell Air Force Base. These figures are for fiscal year 1960, representing actual cost data for the first three quarters of fiscal year 1960 with an estimated expenditure for the last quarter. They do not include such janitorial maintenance as waxing floors, cleaning windows, etc.

Maxwell Air Force Base	$132,000
Carswell Air Force Base	75,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. You base your justifications for this hospital to some extent on increased population at these installations in the face of a stabilized or possibly decreasing troop strength in the Air Force. How do you reconcile this to a large increase in student enrollment at the Air Force schools at this location?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. You are still talking about the medical facilities, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The strength for the school is out of the programing document up through fiscal year 1963. These are the strengths that the Air Force is programing for Maxwell Air Force Base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you any knowledge of the Air Force strength hypothetically as of 1963, upon which you may have had an assumptive premise or a basic premise? Which of the two?

General MINTON. Yes, sir; we have that for 1963. I think again we had better get these figures for you and furnish them for the record, if we may, to back up the increased strength at Maxwell Air Force Base.

(The information requested follows:)

The Air Force determination to increase the student loads in Maxwell Air Force Base service schools was based primarily on the results of an exhaustive study conducted in 1956 by a group that has informally been called the "Rawlings Board." This board emphasized that the Air Force was not training sufficient numbers of officers to provide the quality force required. Specific recommendations were made for the number to be trained in each school. The report rendered by this board was approved by the Chief of Staff, USAF. Since that time, the Air Force has only partially implemented the approved recommendations. It is noted that the total output of USAF students will increase from 6,282 in 1959 to 7,042 in 1962. This is exclusive of allied officers. The latest program information indicates that the grand total for fiscal year 1962 will be 7,477. It is emphasized that the relatively small decreases in total Air Force officer manning do not alter our need to provide advanced professional training for a greater number of career officers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for dormitory space at the present time, and what will be done with these facilities if the new dormitory is constructed?

Colonel PARKHILL. This would satisfy a deficiency. We are short 417 spaces. We propose a new 200-man dormitory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for dormitory space at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have 629 spaces unusable, we have 457 spaces usable substandard, and 516 spaces standard. This project, a 200-man dormitory, will not replace anything. It will satisfy a deficiency. We will continue to use the 629 spaces in temporary dorms.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you want to put this dormitory on top of what you have just given me.

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been happening to the workload you are going to use the dorm for? Where have they been? Do you bring them in from some other geographical area or, if they have been there, how have they been getting along?

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, we see no decrease in the Air University's mission in the foreseeable future. They have a heavy workload there. They have been suffering along with a shortage of dormitories and crowded conditions. This is an attempt to alleviate that crowded condition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, while you have been taking care of the full complement, numerically speaking, to which you have referred, you have done it on a congested premise.

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Here you are actually expanding the opportunity to have more space for your men.

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. GIBBENS. That is partly correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Give me the other part of it.

Mr. GIBBENS. Also we have been using buildings that should not be continued in use. We actually have space down there for 1,400 or 1,500, counting some 457 spaces that we feel should be salvage now. Actually, we feel that our usable assets are about 4 permanent buildings for a total of 513 spaces and 17 temporary buildings with a capacity of about 629 spaces. The rest we feel should be discontinued.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, if there is any surplus after you get the new structure up, it falls in the category of obsolescence and destruction?

Mr. GIBBENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why should a dormitory here cost $1,850 per man and 1,780 across the road at Gunter? The relationship geographically is rather immediate, gentlemen.

General MINTON. Mr. Sheppard, that is a question we ran into. We are making a review of this program, and we shall find out why there is this discrepancy in cost.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have the answer yet?

General MINTON. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the normal procedure, how long do you think it will be before you get a response?

General MINTON. I am sure the people who are supposed to have the answer have it now. I just have not had an opportunity to look at it.

(The information requested is as follows:)

Identical definitive drawings are being utilized for the dormitories at both Gunter and Maxwell. The higher cost of $1,850 per man for Maxwell was based on construction of a single 200-man building compared to $1,780 per man for three 200-man buildings at Gunter. It is considered, however, that the dormitories at both bases could be advertised as a single contract, and even though the contractor would have to operate 2 construction jobs it is conceivable that the 4 buildings for 800 men would result in a lower bid. On this basis, the cost of the Maxwell dormitory could be reduced to $1,780 per man or a total cost of $414,000 including support items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Diverting from the interrogation for a moment, I should like to express my feeling to your gentlemen. In this morning's proceedings we had a series of questions on research put in the record. We as a committee up here feel, because of waiting for you to firm up programs you are dealing with, we have already lost days of our hearing time. In this instance, to you gentlemen it may not have too much appeal, but to us it does have because of the fact that we are having quite a lot of stress applied to the respective chairmen to get these legislative proposals to the floor as promptly as possible. I shall ask you gentlemen to get the answers back in the record promptly. I do not want that record kept down there indefinitely this year. We just cannot afford that. Your problem was expressed through channels to Mr. Sanders. You came to me, and I said, "Fine. We will do what we can to cooperate." Now I am asking for your cooperation in return. I know what it means. I know it takes a lot of time. If you have to get on the phone in this instance to make contact, use it.

General MINTON. If I may go off the record, Mr. Chairman.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to call your attention at this time to page 376 of your justifications, gentlemen. You will find there an item of added OQ requirement. I wish you would tell us what that is. Give us a description of that, please.

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, that will be for a 48-man OQ. They have a deficiency of 510 spaces. This is to satisfy a part of that deficiency.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this supposed to be a general run-of-the-mill or VIP quarters?

Colonel PARKHILL. It will be a standard, definitive Air Force design BOQ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is this figure based upon? Here you have 532. What is the base rated?

General MINTON. I do not know what the base is rated, but offhand, 532 on this is mighty low. We can find out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would.

General MINTON. We did have a VIP quarters at one time considered for this program, Mr. Sheppard. It was dropped out.

(The information requested is as follows:)

The Air Force considers that all of its construction requests are of equal priority. However, under the necessity of relating its requests in a numerical priority sequence, urgent operational facilities, and their related facilities, are assigned the highest priority numbers, with other categories following thereafter. The number "532" does not indicate a low priority item but only unavoidable mechanical necessity.

ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall turn to Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	ANDREWS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI W CAMP SPRINGS	GOVT OWNED	4,393
COUNTY, STATE	PRINCE GEORGES, MD	OTHER ACRES	72
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,465
COMMAND	HQC		
		DATE OCC	1943
PRINCIPAL MISSION	ARDC HQ 2 AIR TRANS SQS NAVAL AIR STA AIR NATIONAL GUARD AIR RESERVE FLYING CENTER COMBAT READINESS TRNG AIR BASE WG		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,226	100	6,156	246	7,728		2,854

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 19: REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
120,000	67,514	39,203	13,283	3,446	9,337

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
COMLOGNET FAC	ADDN	I		NEW	46,502	38,102	8,400	8,400	SF	454
OPER.MISSION TNG.	DFRP	255		NEW	43,560		43,560	32,000	SF	827
SHOP,COMM&ELECT,BASE	DFRP	256		NEW	15,000		15,000	15,000	SF	368
SHOP,NAV/AIDS,BASE		589		NEW	3,600		3,600	3,600	SF	95
SHOP,PARA&DINGHY,BSE	DFRP	590		NEW	11,255	3,784	7,866	11,255	SF	337
WHSE,SUP,&EQUIP,BSE	ADDN	257		NEW	240,049	171,545	68,504	60,000	SF	470
CHAPEL ANNEX		258		NEW	17,500	2,074	15,426	3,800	SF	86
POST OFFICE, CENTRAL		591		NEW	5,771	2,021	3,750	3,750	SF	117
WATER SUPPLY,STORAGE		592		NEW	2000,000	1250,000	750,000	500,000	GA	152
ROAD		259		NEW	665,053	605,653	59,400	37,200	SY	540

Andrews Air Force Base

The only headquarters command installation to be considered is Andrews Air Force Base. The planned use of this base is for Headquarters of Air Research and Development Command, two air transport squadrons for special missions, District of Columbia Air National Guard activities, Air Reserve flying center, Air Defense Command fighter mission, and combat ready training flying. The total program requested for Andrews amounts to $3,446,000 and consists of the following 10 items:

The first item provides an addition to the eastern gateway communications relay station to house the new equipment for operation of the communications logistic network (Comlognet) of the Air Force. This system is a high speed automatic relay system for transmission of punchcard type logistics, and the Andrews facility serves as the communications hub for exchange of logistics data between oversea terminal and zone of interior air materiel areas.

The existing operational mission training buildings are of temporary construction, are improperly located, and inadequate in size and functional space for the newly assigned mission of combining flying activities from Washington National Airport and Bolling AFB to Andrews AFB.

The next item for base communication and electronic shop is needed to provide organizational and field level maintenance on airborne electronic and precision test equipment to support the 380 USAF mixed jet and conventional type aircraft assigned to Andrews AFB.

The base navigational aids shop provides a consolidated facility for centralized maintenance of ILS, TACAN, radar, and radio beacons, VHF, UHF, associated communications consoles and amplifiers. These navigational aids are essential to expeditious air traffic control and safety of flight under all weather conditions. The complex electronic equipment involved requires a high order of maintenance performed in a controlled environment.

The present parachute and dinghy shop is a temporary building totally inadequate in size and functional layout to accomplish the increased workload due to the transfer of flying activities from Washington National Airport and Bolling AFB to Andrews AFB.

The next item for a base warehouse is needed to provide minimum essential space required for general storage of aircraft spares and parts including all spare parts needed for the presidential aircraft which are specifically identified, segregated, and provided with special security control.

The next item for a chapel annex is required to provide religious education for assigned personnel and their dependents.

The next item for a central post office is necessary to accommodate the expected increases in mail traffic. This facility will replace 33 separate and scattered organizational mail type rooms.

The next item will provide an addition to the existing water storage system and an above ground storage tank in the west area of the base. It will insure a balance of pressure in the water mains to protect millions of dollars worth of new facilities and equipment both in this program and those now under construction.

The last item for construction of 2 miles of roads is in support of the Air Force and Navy facilities in this and prior years' programs. This road item is made up of a relocation of a section of the west perimeter road; two new streets on the west side of the base in support of hangar and base operations areas together with a new street on the east side to provide ingress and egress to the Air Force and Navy new warehousing area.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
COMLOGNET facility	Unknown	$30.0	0
Operational mission training	Walton & Madden	45.0	21
Shop, communication and electronic, base.	McGaugham & Johnson	23.0	39
Shop, navigational aids, base	District engineer	5.5	17
Shop, parachute and dinghy, base	McGaugham & Johnson	27.8	0
Warehouse, supply and equipment, base.	Unknown	38.0	0
Chapel annex	do	3.3	0
Post office, central	District engineer	11.4	0
Water supply, storage	do	11.4	0
Road	Unknown	37.0	0

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for operational mission training facilities at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, we have quite a number of small scattered buildings over on the east side of the base in which we have adapted space for the trainers, for classrooms, and things that make up this requirement. The proposal here would be to consolidate all this activity over on the new side of the base in consonance with the logical development of Andrews. This will provide for the classrooms, trainers, instructors' offices, flying equipment, and various things required by the crew for crew training of all pilots assigned in the Washington area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with these facilities if the new ones are funded and constructed?

Colonel PARKHILL. Most of them will be torn down, sir. It is possible that some of them could be used for some form of storage of supplies over in what will be an industrial area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is or is not this facility basically geared to providing proficiency flying training for Air Force officers in the Washington area?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. This is for proficiency flying training for the pilots in the Washington area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that the complete requirement?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have the fighter-interceptor squadron there. No doubt they will benefit from this building—from this facility. It is essentially for the training of all crews in the Washington area who are assigned to Andrews for flying.

General MINTON. Including the Navy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What planes do you plan to transfer from the Washington National Airport to Andrews?

Colonel PARKHILL. The plan is eventually to move all of them over.

General MINTON. Everything.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for a post office at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. They have 2,021 square feet. We propose an addition of 3,750 square feet. It is a matter of its being too small to serve the function.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you are adding to the personnel on the station, and you are increasing the post office to take care of the workload requirement. Is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year you requested over 23,000 square yards of road space. Now you are asking for an additional 37,000. What is the reason for the 37,000 request on top of that which you had last year?

Colonel PARKHILL. This increment will be a relocation of the perimeter road around the new hangars and to provide streets in the new maintenance area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was not contemplated in last year's presentation; is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right, sir. I would not say it was not contemplated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Contemplated, but not ready to be presented here for funding purposes; is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. I think time-phasingwise; this is the logical program for these items.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SYSTEM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall turn our attention to Military Air Transport System and insert page 401 in the record.

(The page follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Aero Chart and Information Center	Military Training Command	$3,200
Charleston Air Force Base	do	167
Dover Air Force Base	do	466
McGuire Air Force Base	do	156
Scott Air Force Base	do	1,219
Travis Air Force Base	do	41
Total		5,249

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have a summary presentation to make, I understand.

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. For the Military Air Transport Service, we have a program involving six bases totaling $5,249,000. We have one item of special interest, the St. Louis Aero Chart and Information Center, referred to as the Aero Chart Plant, $3,200,000. Other projects for MATS: Runway overruns for Dover and McGuire, approach lights for Scott, a fire station for Scott, maintenance facilities at Charleston and Dover, cold storage plant for Scott, medical food inspection building for Travis, and a service club for Scott.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the general status of the plants in total?

Colonel EDMONDS. All of the MATS bases?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those the gentleman has referred to.

Colonel EDMONDS. They vary from 5 to 60 percent complete, 98 percent, 98 percent, 60 percent. They are pretty well along, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The same procedure, I presume, will be followed here, General, that you referred to this morning. In other words, the contract has been let when the plans are finalized.

General MINTON. That is correct, sir.

AERO CHART AND INFORMATION CENTER, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now turn to the Aero Chart and Information Center, St. Louis, Mo.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	AERO CHART & INFO CENTER	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	ST LOUIS MISSOURI	GOVT OWNED	25
COUNTY, STATE		OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	25
COMMAND	MATS	DATE OCC	1952
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AERO CHART & INFO CENTER AF SPEC SECURITY OFFICE		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
40	1	25	21	87		2,794

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
56 000	48,659	879	6,462	3,200	3,262

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
AERO CHART PLANT	2		NEW	537,400	382,400	155,000	93,000	SF	3,200
									3,200

AERONAUTICAL CHART AND INFORMATION CENTER

The Aeronautical Chart and Information Center is located at 2d and Arsenal Streets, St. Louis, Mo.

The center is scheduled for an increase in total working space needed for additional functions of classified projects and the need to replace existing buildings 1, 3, and 6 which are over 100 years old and beyond economical repair. The total requirement for space constitutes a new five-story building of 155,000 square feet. This program provides the first increment of 93,000 square feet (3 stories of 31,000 square feet each floor) for the structure, at a cost of $3,200,000. Two stories are needed to provide part of the space to accommodate the aforementioned classified projects, and one story for replacement of buildings, 1, 3, and 6. It is proposed to add two additional stories to the project in this program to meet the total requirement of 155,000 square feet in future programs.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Aero chart plant	Russell & Axon	$145.6	5

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for these facilities at the present time?

Colonel CHASE. This is for an expanded requirement coming to the Aeronautical Chart and Information Center. It is a requirement for three floors totaling 93,000 square feet to be added to the existing main headquarters building at the Aeronautical Chart Center. Two of these floors, totaling 62,000 square feet, will be used for immediate operational support of our missile forces by exploiting the greatly increased amount of intelligence which we are anticipating to get from our geodetic and other programs.

The other 31,000 square feet is scheduled to replace substandard space now occupied, totaling 37,000 square feet, in three buildings which have been condemned. These house the cafeteria, procurement, and civilian personnel offices.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You gave me the building requirement so far as the local is concerned. What is the basic reason for locating in the St. Louis area?

Colonel CHASE. Sir, the Aeronautical Chart and Information Center is now located in the St. Louis area. These new facilities must be directly adjacent to the existing facilities. Otherwise, the operational effectiveness would be negated and we would lose efficiency in this particular operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What consideration have you given to combining this activity with the Army Map Service in the Washington area?

Colonel CHASE. As far as considering combining it with the Army Map Service in Washington, this has not been specifically considered because the Aeronautical Chart and Information Center directly supports Air Force requirements. The Aeronautical Chart and Information Center is charged with the production of air navigation charts and air target materials in support of air operations, geodetic and gravimetric data in support of our ballistic missile forces, and in the preparation of other types of aeronautical information. We must have the operation continuous and located consistently with the existing chart facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, because of geographical distance and because also of the type of work which is being done by the Map Service, you feel they are not operationally compatible. Is that correct?

Colonel CHASE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would list for the record, gentlemen, the different facilities included in this center, showing the square foot allocation in each instance. Will you please do that when the record comes down?

Colonel CHASE. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Building No.	Functions	Presently allocated square feet	Proposed changes due new construction	End use space	Remarks
	At 2d and Arsenal Sts.:				
1	Cafeteria	7,909	15,000	15,000	Function to new wing.
	Military training	7,557			To building 89004 South Broadway.
	Supply and procurement	7,557	5,400	5,400	Function to new wing.
	Total, building 1	23,023			Building condemned.
2	Incinerator, warehouse for miscellaneous storage.	2,531		2,531	Related dry storage for cafeteria.
3	Officer open mess	5,079	3,100	3,100	Function to new wing.
	Civilian training	3,292			Possession to building 89004 South Broadway.
	Total, building 3	8,371			Building condemned.
4	Civilian training office and 1 classroom.	2,186		2,186	
	USAF audit general	140		140	
	Ground safety office	342		342	
	Total, building 4	2,668		2,668	
5	EDP program	2,062		2,062	
6	Civilian personnel	5,842	7,500	7,500	Function to new wing.
	Total, building 6	5,842			Building condemned.
7	Warehouse and base supply	2,532		2,532	Flammable.
12	Accounting and finance	6,044		6,044	
	Data processing	7,254		7,254	
	Compressor room	112		112	
	Total, building 12	13,410		13,410	
16	Warehouse and base supply	729		729	
	Recreation military auto hobby shop.	1,030		1,030	
	Total, building 16	1,759		1,759	
18	Civil engineering office	3,024		3,024	
	Civil engineering maintenance shop (plumbing, sheet metal, paint, etc.).	6,712		6,712	
	Material, comptroller, unit supply.	765		765	
	Total, building 18	10,501		10,501	
19	Vehicle fuel station	165		165	
20	Pavement and grading shops	6,318		6,318	
22	Technical library chart research	5,567		5,567	Internal use base supply and procurement office after move from building 1.
	Electrical substation	286		286	
	Total, building 22	5,853		5,853	
23	Warehouse, base supply	13,555		13,555	

Building No.	Functions	Presently allocated square feet	Proposed changes due new construction	End use space	Remarks
	At 2d and Arsenal Sts.—Continued				
24	Civil engineering, cover storage	2,700	.....	2,700	
	Warehouse, base supply	10,859	.....	10,859	
	Total, building 24	13,559	.....	13,559	
25	Civil training	8,204	.....	8,204	
27	Traffic check house	195	.....	195	
33	Warehouse, base supply and procurment distribution plant.	21,810	.....	21,810	
36	Missile support (special project)	45,800	62,000	107,800	2 secure floors new wing.
	Cartographic	66,257	.....	66,257	
	Photogrammetry	68,500	.....	68,500	
	Source material research and evaluation.	63,705	.....	57,705	6,000 square feet for utility new wing.
	Geodetic superintendent special project.	9,000	.....	9,000	
	Aero information and flight information publication.	34,400	.....	34,400	
	Printing	40,800	.....	40,800	
	Production and distribution staff office.	10,000	.....	10,000	
	ACIC command and staff office	28,410	.....	28,410	
	Base communications	4,802	.....	3,880	
	Security, air police	808	.....	1,130	
	Lobby, stairwell, elevator	550	.....	1,150	
	Utility superintendent and supply.	23,723	.....	29,723	
	Cafeteria	.....	(15,000)	(15,000)	To replace condemned spaces in buildings 1, 3, 6. 1 floor 31,000 square feet new wing. Not added in total col 4 for building 36.
	Supply and procurement	.....	(5,400)	(5,400)	
	Officers open mess	.....	(3,100)	(3,100)	
	Civil personnel	.....	(7,500)	(7,500)	
	Total, building 36	396,955	62,000	489,955	Includes replacement of condemned space.
37	Technical library (map and geodetic source material).	6,733	.....	6,733	
39	Traffic check house	528	.....	528	
	Total, 2d and Arsenal Sts	546,574	93,000	633,338	
	Less condemned and replacement space.	.....	37,236	31,000	Buildings 1, 3, and 6 condemned part replaced.
	Grand total, 2d and Arsenal Sts	546,574	55,764	602,338	Net increase by new wing 55,764 square feet.
	8000 South Broadway:				
80001	Auto maintenance shop	28,884	.....	28,884	
	Civil engineering administration	630	.....	630	
	Civil engineering shops	15,574	.....	15,574	
	Civil engineering storage	6,738	.....	6,738	
	Redistribution and marketing	23,902	.....	23,902	
	Graining room printing	3,700	.....	3,700	
	Heating plant	5,237	.....	5,237	
	Total, building 80001	84,665	.....	84,665	
80002	Maintenance and distribution charts, publication, air target material, and related items for USAF and others	201,265	.....	192,665	8,600 square feet reduction to replace 6,000 square feet, lost in building 36, 2d and Arsenal for utilities).
	Source material, restoration and evaluation.	.....	.....	8,600	
	Blank paper storage	27,000	.....	27,000	
	Commercial transportation	9,020	.....	9,020	
	Bindery (printing function)	22,630	.....	22,630	
	U.S. Army squadron headquarters, orderly room dayroom and supply.	4,310	.....	4,310	
	USAF guard officer, air police	1,896	.....	1,896	
	Total, building 80002	266,121	.....	266,121	
80003	U.S. Army dormitory for students	18,399	.....	18,399	

Building No.	Functions	Presently allocated square feet	Proposed changes due new construction	End use space	Remarks
	8900 South Broadway—Continued				
89004	U.S. Army school and office	48,501		48,501	
	Cafeteria	2,724		2,724	
	Dispensary	600		600	
	Military training	5,000		5,000	Relocated from building 1—2d and Arsenal.
	Air Force tenant organ (not ACIC).	49,400		49,400	Not aero chart and information center function.
	District division, offices	9,000		9,000	
	Base printed stocks	32,900		32,900	
	Warehouse, box shop, utilities, bulk paper store.	55,881		55,881	
	Total, building 89004	204,006		204,006	
89005	Warehouse, flammables	654		654	
89006	Traffic check house	40		40	
89007	Do	40		40	
	Total, 8900 South Broadway	573,925		573,925	
	Grand total, net ACID controlled space St. Louis	1,120,499	55,764	1,176,263	

NOTE.—Actual usable space available in building 36 at 2d and Arsenal sts. in square feet is based on exterior dimension of building and also includes space occupied by walls, hallways, support columns, elevators, restrooms, utilities, service areas, etc. Recent studies made by ACIC reveal that total square foot figures must be reduced by approximately 24 percent to determine the actual usable space available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall insert the usual data on the other bases in this command.

(The data follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:CHARLESTON AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:5 MI SE N CHARLESTON	GOVT OWNED	:2,915
COUNTY, STATE	:CHARLESTON SC	OTHER ACRES	: 338
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:3,253
COMMAND	:MTC		
		DATE OCC	: 1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:2 AIR TRANSP SQ (M) MATS 2 AIR TRANSP SQ (H) MATS AACS SQ MATS FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC) AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC) ADC		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
789	60	5,089	60	5,998		955

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
58,000	28,600	**20,427	8,973	167	*8,806

* Includes $6,000 BOMARC
**Includes 16.500 Fam Hse

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP A/C MAINT.ORG.	ADDN	450	ADC	NEW	13,118	5,694	7,424	7,424	SF	103
SHOP,REFUELING VEH		598		149	2,196		2,196	2,196	SF	64
										167

Charleston Air Force Base

Charleston Air Force Base is located 7 miles northwest of Charleston, S.C.

The planned use of this base is an aerial port of embarkation for Military Air Transport Service squadrons having both troop and cargo airlift missions. It also has Air Defense Command fighter and missile missions. The program proposed for this station totals $167,000. One item ($103,000) provides an organizational maintenance shop as a leanto to the existing hangar to support the ADC twin engine jet fighter interceptor aircraft scheduled to replace the single-engine aircraft now operating at this base. The requested facility together with the existing organizational maintenance shop will satisfy the total requirement. The other item ($64,000) provides a vehicle refueling shop to overcome a deficiency and satisfy the total requirement. This item was authorized but not included in the fiscal year 1960 military construction appropriations program.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent complete
Shop aircraft maintenance organizational	Unknown	$5.0	6
Shop, refueling vehicle	Charleston district engineer	2.5	2

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:DOVER AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:4 MI NW DOVER	GOVT OWNED	:2,701
COUNTY, STATE	:KENT DELAWARE	OTHER ACRES	: 541
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:3,242
COMMAND	:MTC		
		DATE OCC	: 1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION: AIR TRANSP WG (H)
5 AIR TRANSP SQ (H)
AIR REF SQ (M) SAC
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ ADC

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
919	100	5,889	300	7,208		1,095

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
87,000	60,227	*20,365	6,408	466	5,942

*Includes $12,500 Fam Hse

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
RUNWAY CROSSWIND	OVRN	260		149	33,333		33,333	16,667	SY	190	
RUNWAY,OVERRUNS	RPMT	593		NEW	44,444	22,222	22,222	22,222	SY	147	
SHOP GRND POW EQ		262		149	8,600	4,300	4,300	4,300	SF	129	R
										466	

Dover Air Force Base

Dover Air Force Base is situated 4 miles southeast of Dover, Del.

The planned utilization of this base is an aerial port of embarkation for Military Air Transport Service squadrons having both troop and cargo airlift missions and an Air Defense Command fighter mission.

The total program requested for this installation is $466,000 and provides ($147,000) for the replacement of a substandard runway overrun (1,000 by 200 feet) at the south end of the primary instrument runway required to overcome flying safety hazards day or nighttime, in support of the overall base mission. The north overrun is now under construction. A 12,000-foot runway length is required at this base to support the assigned KC–97 tanker aircraft, as well as MATS aircraft.

The remaining two items were authorized but not included in the fiscal year 1960 military construction appropriations program. One of these items provides ($190,000) for the replacement of a substandard crosswind runway overrun (1,000 feet by 150 feet) at the northwest end of runway 13–31 required to overcome flying safety hazards day or nighttime, in support of the overall base mission. A 12,000 foot runway length is required and only 7,000 feet exist. This overrun is needed to support the assigned KC–97 tanker aircraft, as well as MATS aircraft. The other item provides a ground-powered equipment shop ($129,000) to overcome a base deficiency for the MATS mission. The shop in the SAC area (4,300 square feet) is used to full capacity by the SAC mission.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, crosswind	Philadelphia district engineer	$15.3	98
Runway, overruns	do	21.8	98
Shop ground power equipment	do	11.0	95

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	MCGUIRE AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI NW WRIGHTSTOWN	GOVT OWNED	3,489
COUNTY, STATE	BURLINGTON, N J	OTHER ACRES	67
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,556
COMMAND	MTC	DATE OCC	1948
PRINCIPAL MISSION	HQ EASTAF (MATS) 3 AIR TRANSP SQ (M) (MATS) FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC) AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC) (ADC) HQ NEW YORK AIR DEF SECTOR (SAGE-DC) TAC FTR SQ (ANG) AIR REF SQ (M) (SAC) AIR TRANSP SQ (M) (NAVY)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,157	319	6,772	1,177	9,425		2,674

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
140,000	76,065	53,777*	10,158	156	10,002

*Includes: 30,400 Fam Hsg (300 units)
5,674 AC&W
6,904 BOMARC
42,978

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY, OVERRUNS	DFRP	261	NEW	44,444		44,444	22,222	SY	156
									156

McGuire Air Force Base

McGuire Air Force Base is located 1 mile southeast of Wrightstown, N.J. The planned use of this installation is an aerial port of embarkation for the Military Air Transportation squadrons with troops and cargo airlift assignments, a Strategic Air Command medium tanker mission, Air Defense Command fighter and missile missions, and an Air National Guard tactical fighter unit. The program proposed for this location totals $156,000. The item requested will provide for the replacement of a substandard overrun (1,000 by 200 feet) on the approach (24) end of the primary instrument runway (6/24) to overcome flying safety hazards, day or nighttime, in support of the SAC, ADC, and MATS missions assigned to this base. A 12,000-foot runway length is required at this base to support the KC–97 aircraft. Both of the overruns for this runway are deficient.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, overruns	Philadelphia district engineer	$12.7	60

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:SCOTT AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:3 MI WNW SHILOH	GOVT OWNED	:2,356
COUNTY, STATE	::ST CLAIR ILLINOIS	OTHER ACRES:	383
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:2,739
COMMAND	:MATS		
		DATE OCC	: 1917

PRINCIPAL MISSION :HQ MATS
HQ AIR WEA SERV
HQ AIRWAYS & AIR COMM SERV
TROOP CARRIER WG HQ (M) (CNR)
TROOP CARRIER SQ (M) (CNR)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,120	36	2,520	37	3,713		2,567

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 58 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
90,000	60,760	*23,946	5,294	1,219	4,075

*Includes 12,300 Fam Hse

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING,APPROACH		596		NEW	4,500		4,500	3,000	FT	255
FIRE STA.COMBINATION	RPMT	597		NEW	13,794		13,794	13,794	SF	369
COLD STOR,FOOD,BASE	RPMT	599		149	5,315		5,315	5,315	SF	220
CLUB,SERVICE	RPMT	601		NEW	12,700		12,700	12,700	SF	375
										1,219

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE

Scott Air Force Base is situated 3 miles southeast of Shiloh, Ill. The planned utilization of this base is to provide headquarters for Military Air Transport Service, Air Weather Service, and Airways and Air Communications Service, and an Air Force Reserve Flying Training Center with a troop-carrier mission. The requested program for this station includes four items totaling $1,219,000.

The first of these items provides approach lighting for the approach end of the primary instrument runway to overcome flying safety hazards in support of the overall base mission. A 1,000-foot approach light facility exists, but it is substandard and will be removed.

The second item provides for the replacement of four inadequate and improperly located fire and crash rescue stations with a combination fire station. The present split firefighting operation is uneconomical and requires extra manpower to operate. The requested facility will satisfy total base requirements.

The third item provides for the replacement of a substandard airmen service club to be located in the development area A. The structure is needed to provide off-duty recreational programs for airmen.

The last item provides $220,000 for funding an item authorized but not included in the fiscal year 1960 military construction appropriations program. The project replaces the base food cold-storage facility which is beyond economical repair and has been classified unusable and scheduled for demolition when the proposed facility is available.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting, approach	Unknown	$12	20
Fire station, combination	do	22	20
Cold storage, food, base	Chicago district engineer	11	20
Club, service	Unknown	24	2[illegible]

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:TRAVIS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:6 MI W FAIRFIELD	GOVT OWNED	:4,311
COUNTY, STATE	:SOLANO, CALIFORNIA	OTHER ACRES	:1,029
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:5,340
COMMAND	:MATS		
		DATE OCC	: 1943

PRINCIPAL MISSION: HQ WESTAF (MATS)
AIR TRANSP WG (H) MATS
4 AIR TRANSP SQ (H) MATS
2 NAVAL AIR TRANSP SQ (M) MATS
AIR REF SQ (H) SAC
BOMB SQ (H) SAC
AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC) ADC
TRANSP CONTR CARR

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,668	765	10,390	1,785	14,608		2,231

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
130.000	107,301	*17,559	5,140	41	5,099

*Includes 10,400 Fam Hse
2,923 MSLE
13,323

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
MED.FOOD INSPECTION	RPMT	600	NEW	1.000		1.000	1.000	SF	41
									41

Travis Air Force Base

The last of the bases included in this program is Travis Air Force Base. It is located 6 miles east of Fairfield, Calif. The planned use of this station is a west coast aerial port of embarkation for the Military Air Transport Service for a wing with 3 heavy and 2 medium squadrons having troop and cargo airlift missions. It also provides for transient contract carriers. In addition, the Strategic Air Command utilizes this airfield for heavy bomber and tanker missions, and the Air Defense Command maintains fighter and missile units at this location. The program requested for this station totals $41,000 and includes an item for the replacement of a temporary structure to provide an adequate food inspection laboratory. Building T–342 (3,478 square feet) constructed in 1944 is beyond economical repair, classified as unusable and is scheduled for demolition.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Medical food inspection	Unknown	$4.3	5

HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII

Mr. Sheppard. Now pick up Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	HICKAM AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	HONOLULU	GOVT OWNED	2,403
COUNTY, STATE	HAWAII	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,403
COMMAND	PACAF		
		DATE OCC	1937
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR RES SQ FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ STRATEGIC SUPPORT		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
842	422	4,113	940	6,317	882	2,049

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
76,000	63,404	1,632	10,964	265	10,699

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY, INSTRUMENT	MOD	81		NEW	105,933	105,933		11,111	SY	265
										265

Hickam Air Force Base

The next Pacific installation to be considered is Hickam Air Force Base which is located 6 miles west of the city of Honolulu in Hawaii. The planned use of this base is for Headquarters of the Pacific Air Forces, Air Defense of Hawaii, Strategic Air Command support mission, an air rescue squadron, and a weather reconnaissance squadron. The requested program amounts to $265,000 and consists of the following item:

Replacement of a 500-foot section of the west end of the instrument runway. This pavement has deteriorated under the effects of jet blast until it has become dangerous to operating aircraft.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, instrument	District engineer	$13	1

Mr. Sheppard. Thank you, gentlemen, for your presentations.

The committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Wednesday, April 20, 1960.

Mr. Sheppard. The committee will be in order.

Strategic Air Command

We shall take up the Strategic Air Command and insert in the record at this point the summary table on page 423 and 424.

(The table follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)	Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Altus AFB	SAC	$109	Homestead AFB	SAC	$463
Barksdale AFB	SAC	7,395	Larson AFB	SAC	1,630
Beale AFB	SAC	1,558	Loring AFB	SAC	500
Bergstrom AFB	SAC	866	March AFB	SAC	15,486
Blytheville AFB	SAC	2,020	McCoy AFB	SAC	786
Bunker Hill AFB	SAC	1,726	Mountain Home AFB	SAC	695
Carswell AFB	SAC	170	Offutt AFB	SAC	3,826
Castle AFB	SAC	2,678	Plattsburgh	SAC	80
Clinton-Sherman AFB	SAC	1,221	Turner AFB	SAC	2,676
Columbus AFB	SAC	2,829	Vandenberg AFB	SAC	1,284
Davis-Monthan AFB	SAC	222	Walker AFB	SAC	156
Dow AFB	SAC	3,160	Westover AFB	SAC	177
Ellsworth AFB	SAC	878	Whiteman AFB	SAC	640
Fairchild AFB	SAC	5,951	Wurtsmith AFB	SAC	3,269
Forbes AFB	SAC	635			
Francis E. Warren AFB	SAC	445	Total		68,736
Glasgow AFB	SAC	5,196			

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. Sheppard. Do you have a summary statement you wish to present at this time?

Colonel Parkhill. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This next section of the program provides for the Strategic Air Command inside the United

States, exclusive of the missiles. It involves 31 bases for a total of $68,736,000.

The special and high-cost projects amount to $39,177,000.

They are as follows: Barksdale Air Force Base, combat operations center, $6,952,000.

March Air Force Base, combat operations center, $7,870,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Headquarters Command modification, $1,872,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, runway and taxiway replacement, $5,089,000.

March Air Force Base, runway extension, taxiway, runway overruns and taxiway shoulder stabilization, $6,172,000.

Castle, composite medical facility, $2,006,000.

Dow, composite medical facility, $1,787,000.

At eight bases we have the large docks which were covered in the repetitive item presentation, $7,429,000.

Other projects include various airfield pavements at 5 bases, aircraft wash racks for 6 bases, operational training facilities on 11 bases, approach lights on 15 bases, operations mission training buildings at 6 bases, narrow gage center line lights at 6 bases, airfield maintenance shops at 3 bases, engine inspection and repair shops at 3 bases, refueling vehicle shop at 5 bases, armament and electronics shop at 7 bases, auto maintenance facilities at 4 bases, various miscellaneous facilities at 6 bases, jet fuel storage at 9 bases, warehousing at 4 bases, other smaller supply facilities at 4 bases, dental clinic on 1 base, administrative facilities for 2 bases, dormitories for 3 bases, dining hall, airmen, for 2 bases, officers quarters for 3 bases, religious facilities for 4 bases, recreational and community facilities for 4 bases, utilities and real estate for 3 bases.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall insert in the record at this point the justification data pertaining to all of the projects we shall not consider in detail hereafter.

(The data follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	ALTUS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI W ALTUS	GOVT OWNED	2,428
COUNTY, STATE	JACKSON, OKLA	OTHER ACRES	872
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,300
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
373	10	2,587	15	2,985		315

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
103,000	34,481	63,004	5,515	109	5,406

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP A/C MAINT FIELD	I		NEW	48,000	34,760	13,240	6,313	SF	109
									109

Altus Air Force Base

The first Strategic Air Command base to be considered is Altus Air Force Base. It is located approximately 3 miles east of Altus, Okla. Its planned use is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission. It will also be used as a Strategic Air Command air division headquarters. The program requested for Altus Air Force Base amounts to $109,000 and provides a 6,313 square-foot addition to the existing maintenance dock by closing in each side of the nose section. At present, there is a deficiency of 13,240 square-feet in field maintenance shop space. This 6,313 square-feet will partially alleviate this deficiency and is specifically required to provide a fuel/cell repair shop to support the heavy bomber aircraft.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop aircraft maintenance field	Unknown	$7	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	BARKSDALE AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	BOSSIER CITY	GOVT OWNED	21,829
COUNTY, STATE	BOSSIER, LOUISIANA	OTHER ACRES	367
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	22,196
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1932
PRINCIPAL MISSION	2ND AF HQ AIR DIV SQ STRATEGIC WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ STRATEGIC STANDARDIZATION GP		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAF
1,278	283	5,669	187	7,417		608

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
81,000	60,458	7,980	12,562	7,395	5,167

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TELEPHONE DUCT FAC	ADDN	I		NEW	328,230	324,140	4,090	4,090	FT	16
LIGHTING APPROACH	ADDN	376		NEW	3,000	1,600	1,400	1,400	FT	122
LIGHTING APPROACH	DFRP	I		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	175
COMBAT OPNS CTR		I		NEW	42,950		42,950	42,950	SF	6,952
SHOP,PARA&DINGHY BS	ADDN	362		149	7,122	3,622	3,500	3,500	SF	130
										7,395

Barksdale Air Force Base

Barksdale Air Force Base is situated in Bossier City, La. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command second AF headquarters, a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission, an air division headquarters, and an Air Force Reserve activity. The program requested for Barksdale totals $7,395,000. It includes the following items:

The first item provides an additional 4,090 linear feet of telephone duct for needed cable expansion The present ducts are overcrowded with cables, leaving no room for installation of additional lines and making repair work on present lines very difficult and expensive.

The next item provides an addition of 1,400 feet to the 1,600 feet of approach lighting system now under construction to provide a complete 3,000 feet of U.S. national standard approach lighting system at the primary instrument end of the runway.

The next item consists of converting to U.S. national standards the existing 1,600 feet of substandard approach lighting system and adding 1,400 feet to provide a complete 3,000-foot U.S. national standard approach lighting system at the secondary end of the runway.

The next item will provide a combat operation center, the nature of which is classified.

The last item provides for an addition of 3,500 square feet to the existing 3,622 square foot building to provide a parachute and dinghy shop of 7,122 square feet. The work is now being accomplished in the existing building and two temporary buildings. The two temporary buildings are considered to be beyond economical repair and will be destroyed upon completion of this addition to the existing standard building.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Telephone duct facility	District engineer	$2	5
Lighting approach	do	6	5
Do	do	9	5
Combat operations center	Unknown	350	5
Shop, parachute, and dinghy BS	Van Os & Flaxman	14	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	BEALE AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	13 MI W MARYSVILLE	GOVT OWNED	85,982
COUNTY, STATE	YUBA & NEVADA, CALIF	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	85,982
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ STRATEGIC WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ SAN FRANCISCO ADS HQ (ADC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
561	10	3,603	25	4,199		347

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
127,000	30,479	89,855	6,666	1,558	5,108

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
WASHRACK, AIRCRAFT	329		NEW	1		1	1	EA	150
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C	I		NEW	8	4	4	3	EA	1,200
SHOP ARM &ELECT, ADDN	356		NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	124
STOR BASE JET FUEL	365		NEW	72,408	50,280	22,128	20,000	BL	84
									1,558

Beale Air Force Base

Beale Air Force Base is situated 13 miles east of Marysville, Calif. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomb mission, an air defense sector headquarters, and other missions. The program requested for Beale totals $1,558,000. It includes the following items:

The first item is a washrack facility. Frequent washing of the aircraft is necessary to keep them properly cleaned to eliminate corrosion and aid in the dissipation of heat from engines.

The next item provides for procurement and erection of three standard large aircraft maintenance docks. Two of these docks will provide additional maintenance space for the heavy bomber and tanker aircraft, and the third dock will provide needed maintenance facilities for assigned miscellaneous transient and base aircraft. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of eight large type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item requests an addition to the existing armament and electronic facility to provide additional storage and maintenance space, required for the complex electronic equipment.

The last item will provide storage facilities for jet fuel. There is existing 50,280 barrels of jet fuel storage. This request will substantially satisfy the requirement for this facility.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Washrack, aircraft	District engineer	$8	2
Maintenance dock, large aircraft	AMC	60	100
Shop, armament and electronic	District engineer	11	3
Storage base, jet fuel	do	8	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	BERGSTROM AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI NW AUSTIN	GOVT OWNED	3,168
COUNTY, STATE	TRAVIS, TEXAS	OTHER ACRES	675
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,843
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	STRATEGIC WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ AAA MSLE (NIKE) BN (USA)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/RQT	BASE	TRANS/RQT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
350	10	2,395	15	2,770		294

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
47,000	28,525	14,484	3,991	866	3,125

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TAXIWAY APRON ACCESS	I		NEW	27,111		27,111	27,111	SY	673
LIGHTING APPROACH	337		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	193
									866

Bergstrom Air Force Base

Bergstrom Air Force Base is located 5 miles southeast of Austin, Tex. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission. The program requested at Bergstrom totals $866,000. It includes two items:

The first item provides a heavy duty taxiway access to an existing field maintenance hangar. The existing taxiway is of light duty construction and will not support the assigned aircraft.

The second item provides 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights at the secondary end of the primary runway. The lights are essential to the safe, regular, and efficient operation of the mission aircraft. Approximately 50 percent of all aircraft landings during periods of low visibility use this runway approach.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Taxiway apron access	District engineer	$32	5
Lighting approach	do	9	60

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	BUNKER HILL AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI E BUNKER HILL	GOVT OWNED	2,738
COUNTY, STATE	MIAMI, INDIANA	OTHER ACRES	70
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,808
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	MED BOMBARDMENT WG HQ MED BOMBARDMENT WG HVY AIR REFUELING SQ FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/SQT	BASE	TRANS/SQT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
418	13	2,713	16	3,160		291

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
61,000	32,657	22,134	6,209	1,726	4,483

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
DEFLECTOR JET BLAST		213		NEW	2,145		2,145	2,145	LF	107	
LIGHTING R/W NGCL		40		NEW	1		1	1	EA	350	
OPERATION MISS TNG	ADDN	214		NEW	46,350	19,550	26,800	16,075	SF	423	
SHOP GRND POWRD EQUI		46		149	5,000		5,000	5,000	SF	130	R
STOR BASE JET FUEL		392		NEW	103,000	76,660	26,340	25,000	BL	98	
WAREHOUSE, BASE		48		NEW	142,935	111,379	31,556	20,905	SF	259	
DENTAL CLINIC	ADDN	106		NEW	5,680	4,429	1,251	1,251	SF	59	
WATER SUP TREATMEN	ADDN	416		NEW	1,850	450	1,400	1,400	TD	300	
										1,726	

Bunker Hill Air Force Base

Bunker Hill Air Force Base is located 2 miles west of Peru, Ind. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command medium bomber unit and an Air Defense Command fighter mission. The total program requested for Bunker Hill amounts to $1,726,000. This program includes the following items:

The first item furnishes jet blast deflectors which will be installed behind the aircraft parking positions to protect personnel and equipment from damage by high velocity jet blasts.

The next item provides for installation of narrow gage and centerline runway lighting systems. This system is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required for the recovery of aircraft during periods of inclement weather.

The next item provides for an addition to the existing operational mission training facilities. The requirement for training facilities at Bunker Hill are 46,350 square feet. The present 19,550-square foot facility is inadequate to accommodate the training devices, simulators, and functions programed for Bunker Hill. This request of 16,075 square feet will alleviate a deficiency in training facilities at this base.

The next item is for a 5,000-square foot ground powered equipment shop and a 12,780-square foot storage area for maintenance and storage of approximately 350 pieces of ground powered equipment planned for Bunker Hill Air Force Base. There is nothing existing which can be used to satisfy this requirement.

The next item is additional jet fuel bulk storage. The requirement for jet fuel storage at Bunker Hill is 103,000 barrels. A total of 76,660 barrels is existing. The 25,000 barrels in this request will substantially satisfy the remaining deficiency.

The next item is a warehouse which will alleviate a deficiency in warehouse space and provide storage of flyaway kits.

The next item furnishes a required addition to the existing dental clinic facility.

The last item provides for an additional modification to the existing water softening plant.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Reflector jet blast	District public works officer	$5	0
Lighting R/WNOCL	do	18	0
Operation mission training	do	21	0
Shop ground powered equipment	do	6	100
Storage base jet fuel	do	5	0
Warehouse, base	Associate architect and engineers	12	100
Dental clinic	District public works officer	3	0
Water supply treatment	do	60	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	CARSWELL AFB	GOVT LEASED	70
DIR TO TOWN	FORT WORTH	GOVT OWNED	2,185
COUNTY, STATE	TARRANT, TEXAS	OTHER ACRES	158
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,413
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ RADAR BOMB SCORING GP MED BOMBARDMENT WG		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
466	30	3,224	62	3,782		416

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
68,000	44,140	19,909	3,951	170	3,781

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING APPROACH	RPMT 377		NEW	1,000		1,000	1,000	FT	170
									170

CARSWELL AIR FORCE BASE

Carswell Air Force Base is in Fort Worth, Tex. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command medium bomber mission and various other miscellaneous Strategic Air Command service activities. The total program requested for Carswell amounts to $170,000. It provides for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights (without stro-beacon flashers) at the secondary end of the primary runway. These lights are essential to the safe and efficient opeation of the high performance military aircraft at this base since more than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	District engineer	$9	85

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	CLINTON SHERMAN AFB	GOVT LEASED	2,577
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI ESE BURNS FLAT	GOVT OWNED	454
COUNTY, STATE	WASHITA, OKLA	OTHER ACRES	650
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,681
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1943
PRINCIPAL MISSION	STRATEGIC WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
353	10	2,285	15	2,663		284

EST TOTAL COST ($000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 ($000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($000)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($000)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($000)	FUTURE YEARS ($000)
39,000	22,001	13,833	3,166	1,221	1945

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($000)
WASHRACK AIRCRAFT	331		NEW	1		1	1	EA	102
LIGHTING APPROACH	339		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	117
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C	I		NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	909
STOR BASE JET FUEL	367		NEW	75,598	45,598	30,000	25,000	BL	93
									1,221

Clinton Sherman Air Force Base

Clinton Sherman Air Force Base is situated 1 mile west-northwest of Burns Flat, Okla. Strategic heavy bombers and refueling aircraft will operate from this base. The program requested at Clinton Sherman totals $1,221,000 and includes the following items:

The first item is an aircraft washrack facility. Frequent washing is necessary to eliminate corrosion, reduce drag, and aid in dissipation of heat from engines.

The next item is for installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights at the secondary end of the primary runway. These lights are essential to the safe and efficient operation of the high performance aircraft. More than 35 percent of all landings are made on the secondary end of the runway.

The next item provides for two additional aircraft maintenance docks to accommodate large aircraft. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large aircraft type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The last item provides for an additional 25,000 barrels of jet fuel bulk storage. The requirement for storage at Clinton Sherman is 75,598 barrels, with 45,598 barrels of existing. This request will satisfy the remaining deficiency.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Washrack aircraft	District public works officer	$5	5
Lighting approach	do	6	5
Maintenance dock, large A/C	AMC	45	100
Storage base, jet fuel	District public works officer	5	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	DAVIS MONTHAN AFB	GOVT LEASED	4,998
DIR TO TOWN	4 MI NW TUCSON	GOVT OWNED	6,187
COUNTY, STATE	PIMA, ARIZONA	OTHER ACRES	121
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	11,306
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	
PRINCIPAL MISSION			1927
	MED BOMBARDMENT WG		
	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
616	51	4,322	74	5,063		990

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
63,000	45,176	13,330	4,494	222	4,272

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RAPCON CENTER	I		NEW	6,034		6,034	6,034	SF	222
									222

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base

The next base to be considered is Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, located 4 miles southeast of Tucson, Ariz. The planned use of Davis-Monthan is for a Strategic Air Command medium bomber mission, an Air Defense Command fighter mission and other Strategic Air Command missions. The program requested amounts to $222,000 and consists of a 6,034 square foot radar approach control center for air traffic control of aircraft in the area under all weather conditions.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Rapcon center	Unknown	$14	1

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	ELLSWORTH AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	7 MI SW RAPID CITY	GOVT OWNED	3,212
COUNTY, STATE	MEADE, SO DAKOTA	OTHER ACRES	775
COUNTRY,		TOTAL ACRES	3,987
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ FIR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC) RADAR SQ (SAGE-ADC) AAA MSLE (NIKE) BN (USA)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
634	40	4,223	50	4,947		572

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
134,000	71,659	55,894	6,447	878	5,569

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TAXIWAY RUNWAY ACCES	RPMT	I		NEW				11,890	SY	301
LIGHTING APPROACH		379		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	280
LIGHTING APPROACH	ADDN	I		NEW	3,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	FT	195
FLIGHT SIM TRNG	ADDN	19	ADC	685	4,897	2,016	2,881	2,881	SF	102
										878

Taxiway Runway Access
Lighting Approach
Flight Simulator Training

Eglin Auxiliary Field #9, Florida
The Eglin Auxiliary Field #9 is located approximately 20 miles northeast of Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, and is bounded on both sides by U.S. Highway 90. The field is the site of the Air Force Armament Center's Air Proving Ground Center Headquarters and four operational squadrons. The Air Proving Ground Center Headquarters is responsible for the operation of the Eglin Gulf Test Range. The four squadrons are responsible for operating the Eglin Gulf Test Range and for providing aircraft and pilots for the Air Force Armament Center's test and evaluation programs.

The taxiway runway access project will provide a taxiway and apron to the runway for the Air Force Armament Center's aircraft. The taxiway will be 50 feet wide and 2,200 feet long. The apron will be 11,890 square yards and will have a concrete pavement. The taxiway and apron will be constructed of concrete pavement.

The lighting approach project will provide a lighting system for the approach to the runway for the Air Force Armament Center's aircraft. The lighting system will be a high intensity system and will be 3,000 feet long. The lighting system will be constructed of concrete pavement.

The lighting approach addition project will provide an addition to the lighting approach system for the Air Force Armament Center's aircraft. The addition will be 1,500 feet long and will be constructed of concrete pavement.

The flight simulator training project will provide a flight simulator training center for the Air Force Armament Center's aircraft. The flight simulator training center will be 2,881 square feet and will be constructed of concrete pavement.

Ellsworth Air Force Base

Ellsworth Air Force Base is located 7 miles northeast of Rapid City, S. Dak. The planned use is a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission, including both bomber and air tanker aircraft, and an Air Defense Command fighter and Radar Sage mission. The program requested totals $878,000 and it includes four items:

The first item will strengthen a 50- by 2,140-foot keel section of taxiway pavement connecting the apron with the southeast end of the runway. This pavement has shown structural distress under the loads of the heavy bomber aircraft.

The second item provides for the installation of 3,000 feet U.S. standard approach lights at the secondary end of the runway. These lights are essential to the safe and efficient operation of the high-performance aircraft since more than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

The third item consists of an addition of 1,500 feet to the 1,500 feet of approach lighting system now under construction to provide 3,000 feet of U.S. Standard approach lights at the primary instrument end of the runway.

The last item is a 2,881-square-foot addition to the existing 2,016-square-foot flight simulator training building to support the Air Defense Command new century series fighter interceptor aircraft assigned to this base.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Taxiway runway access	District engineer	$15	30
Lighting approach	do	18	30
Do	do	10	30
Flight simulator training	Hugill, Blatherwick, Fritzel & Kroeger.	5	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	FORBES AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI N TOPEKA	GOVT OWNED	2,676
COUNTY, STATE	SHAWNEE, KANSAS	OTHER ACRES	878
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,554
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	
PRINCIPAL MISSION			1942
	MED BOMBARDMENT WG		
	MED STRATEGIC RECON SQ		
	HVY AIR REFUELING SQ		
	STRATEGIC MSLE SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/MOT	BASE	TRANS/MOT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
638	40	3,303	40	4,021		377

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
101,000	53,907	39,245	7,848	635	7,213

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING APPROACH		380		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	150
LIGHTING R-W NGCL		41		NEW	1		1	1	EA	350
COLD STOR FOOD BAS	RPMT	47		NEW	4,315		4,315	4,315	SF	135
										635

Forbes Air Force Base

Forbes Air Force Base is located 6 miles south of Topeka, Kans. The planned use of this base is for Strategic Air Command medium bomber and heavy air refueler mission, strategic missile mission, and strategic medium reconnaissance mission. The program request for Forbes amounts to $635,000 and includes three items:

The first item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights at the secondary end of the primary runway and is essential to the safe operation of the mission aircraft. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

The second item, lighting runway, narrow gage and centerline, is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely bad weather.

The third item provides for a 4,315 square foot cold storage facility for perishable subsistence to replace the existing World War II mobilization type warehouse building. The existing facility is in an advanced state of deterioration resulting in high maintenance costs and submarginal sanitary conditions.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	Servis, Van Doren & Hazard	$8	30
Lighting runway, narrow gage, centerline.	do	18	30
Cold storage food base	do	7	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	HOMESTEAD AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI SSW HOMESTEAD	GOVT OWNED	2,771
COUNTY, STATE	DADE, FLORIDA	OTHER ACRES	399
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,170
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION

HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ
MED STRATEGIC RECON WG
MED TRP CARRIER (CNC RES)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
1,014	10	4,747	15	5,786		507

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
52,000	41,580	8,315	2,105	463	1,642

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING R/W NGCL	I		NEW	1		1	1	EA	463
									463

HOMESTEAD AIR FORCE BASE

Homestead Air Force Base is located 5 miles north-northeast of Homestead, Fla. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber unit, a Strategic Air Command medium reconnaissance mission and other Strategic Air Command activities and Air Force Reserve activities. The program requested for Homestead totals $463,000 and provides for installation of narrow gage and centerline runway lighting system. This system is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required for the recovery of aircraft during periods of inclement weather.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting runway, narrow gage, centerline.	District engineer	$23	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	LORING AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	4 MI SE LIMESTONE	GOVT OWNED	8,414
COUNTY, STATE	AROOSTOOK, MAINE	OTHER ACRES	360
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	8,774
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1953

PRINCIPAL MISSION
AIR DIV HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQS (2)
HVY AIR REFUELING SQ
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)
AAA MSLE BN (USA)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
730	35	4,898	15	5,678		397

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
147,000	127,813	14,589	4,598	500	4,098

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING R/W NGCL		42		NEW	1		1	1	EA	425
TOWER CONTROL	ADDN	383		NEW	4,824	2,675	2,149	1,335	SF	75
										500

Loring Air Force Base

Loring Air Force Base is located 4 miles northwest of Limestone, Maine. This base will be used primarily by Strategic heavy bombers, heavy air refueling aircraft, and an Air Defense fighter interceptor unit.

The program requested for Loring amounts to $500,000 and includes two items:

The first item, entitled "lighting runway, narrow gage, and centerline," is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely bad weather.

The second item provides for a 1,355 square-foot addition and modification of the existing control tower by raising the control cab elevation approximately 30 feet. Existing maintenance docks restrict the tower operators' view of the south area of the runway, where the Strategic Air Command and Air Defense Command alert complexes are located.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting runway, narrow gage, centerline.	Division engineer	$21	0
Tower control	Unknown	4	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	MARCH AFB	GOVT LEASED	1,734
DIR TO TOWN	8 MI NW RIVERSIDE	GOVT OWNED	7,349
COUNTY, STATE	RIVERSIDE, CALIF	OTHER ACRES	383
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	9,466
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1918

PRINCIPAL MISSION

15TH AIR FORCE HQ
AIR DIV HQ
STRATEGIC WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ
RADAR BOMB SCORING SQ
MED TRP CARRIER WG HQ (CNC-RES)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
921	72	4,366	36	5,395		541

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
101,000	63,396	12,283	25,321	15,486	9,835

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY, PRIM/INSTRUM	WDN	I		NEW	443,333	295,555	147,778	147,778	SY	4,462
RUNWAY OVERRUNS		I		149	66,666		66,666	44,444	SY	188
RUNWAY, OVERRUNS	WDN	I		NEW				22,222	SY	87
TAXIWAY, RUNWAY ACCE	STR	I		NEW				48,678	SY	1,065
SHOULDER, STABIL,		I		NEW				47,264	SY	370
WASHRACK, AIRCRAFT		332		NEW	1		1	1	EA	94
LIGHTING R/W NGCL		I		NEW	1		1	1	EA	350
COMBAT OPS CTR		I		149	42,950		42,950	42,950	SF	5,651
COMBAT OPS CTR		I		NEW					LS	2,069
MAINT DOCK LARGE A		I		NEW	5	2	3	2	EA	1,000
LAND, FEE PURCHASE		I		NEW				200	AC	150

March Air Force Base

March Air Force Base is located approximately 8 miles southeast of Riverside, Calif. The 15th Air Force Headquarters is located in March Air Force Base, and the principal flying missions are strategic heavy bombers and other Strategic Air Command and Air Force Reserve activities. The total program being requested is $15,486,000. Included in this program are the following:

The first item is for strengthening and widening the primary runway to provide a 13,300-foot-long by 300-foot-wide runway which will accommodate the operation of the heavy bomber aircraft now scheduled for March Air Force Base.

The next two items to be constructed concurrently provide paved overruns, 1,000 feet long by 300 feet wide, at each end of the primary runway to support aircraft should they undershoot or overrun the runway during critical operations. The first of these two items was authorized under Public Law 86-149 for a 200-foot wide overrun for medium bomber operation but with the necessary widening of the runway for B-52 operation, additional scope is required to provide 300-foot wide overruns.

The next item provides strengthening sections of the runway access taxiway which will be subjected to continuous heavy bomber aircraft traffic.

The next item provides for the shoulder stabilization of the above runway access taxiway to support the operation of the heavy bomber aircraft.

The next item is a wash rack facility. Frequent washing of the aircraft is necessary to eliminate corrosion and aid in dissipation of heat from engines.

The next item, "Narrow gage and centerline lighting," is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely bad weather.

The next two items provide a combat operation center, the nature of which is classified.

The next item provides for two additional aircraft maintenance docks to accommodate large aircraft. Adequate maintenance of these aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The last item is for the fee purchase of 200 acres of land for the above classified facility.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, primary, instrument	Unknown	$223	5
Runway, overruns	do	4	5
Do	Donald R. Warren Co.	17	90
Taxiway, runway access strip	Unknown	82	5
Shoulder, stabilization	do	19	5
Washrack, aircraft	do	5	5
Lighting, runway, narrow gage and centerline	do	18	5
Combat operations center	Unknown and district engineer	103	6
Do	do	283	6
Maintenance dock, large	AMC	50	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	MCCOY AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	8 MI ORLANDO	GOVT OWNED	3,825
COUNTY, STATE	ORANGE, FLORIDA	OTHER ACRES	460
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,285
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1943

PRINCIPAL MISSION

HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ
MED BOMBARDMENT WG
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)
AIR PHOTO CHARTING SER HQ (MTC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAP
364	30	2,655	10	3,059		301

EST TOTAL COST ($000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 ($000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($000)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($000)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($000)	FUTURE YEARS ($000)
62,000	33,483	23,970	4,547	786	3,761

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($000)
APRON OPERATIONAL	17	ADC	NEW	21,750		21,750	21,750	SY	507
READINESS CREW	18	ADC	NEW	10,750		10,750	10,750	SF	279
									786

McCoy Air Force Base

McCoy Air Force Base is located 8 miles southeast of Orlando, Fla. Its planned use is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber and medium bomber mission, an Air Defense Command fighter mission and a Military Transport Command airphoto charting service mission. The program requested for McCoy amounts to $786,000 and consists of two items to support the Air Defense Command fighter mission.

The first item provides for an aircraft parking apron which is required to park the eight fighter interceptor aircraft in the Air Defense Command area.

The second item provides for a readiness crew facility to be located in the Air Defense Command complex.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Apron operational	District engineer	$26	10
Readiness crew	do	14	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	MOUNTAIN HOME AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	10 MI NE MT HOME	GOVT OWNED	5,930
COUNTY, STATE	ELMORE, IDAHO	OTHER ACRES	693
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	6,623
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ MED BOMBARDMENT WG MED AIR REFUELING SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ AAA MSLE BN (USA)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
670	10	4,414	14	5,108		350

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
132,000	47,579	76,905	7,516	695	6,821

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING APPROACH		558		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	176
HQ GROUP AIR BASE	RPMT	560		NEW	29,440	8,525	20,915	18,400	SF	519
										695

Mountain Home Air Force Base

Mountain Home Air Force Base is situated approximately 10 miles southwest of Mountain Home, Idaho. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command medium bomber mission, including medium bomber and air refueler aircraft and a strategic missile mission. The program requested for Mountain Home totals $695,000 and consists of two items:

The first item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights (without strobeacon flashers) at the secondary end of the primary runway. These lights are essential to the safe and efficient operation of the high performance military aircraft at this base since more than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

The second item is for an 18,400 square foot air base group headquarters to replace existing theater-of-operation type, tar paper covered structures and provide an adequate facility in which to perform the activities of the combat support group.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	District engineer	$9	20
Headquarters Group Air Base	Unknown	26	10

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	OFFUTT AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI NE BELLEVUE	GOVT OWNED	1,722
COUNTY, STATE	SARPY, NEBRASKA	OTHER ACRES	19
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,741
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	1888
PRINCIPAL MISSION	STRATEGIC AIR CMD HQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ TEST WG (ARDC) DATA PROCESSING SQ (ARDC) AAA MSLE BN (USA)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,960	77	7,479	72	9,588		1,202

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
134,000	57,303	62,757	13,940	3,826	10,114

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP, REFUELING VEH		537		149	2,116		2,116	2,116	SF	103
STORAGE,BS, JET FUEL		538		685	54,915	27,834	27,081	10,000	BL	99
HQS COMMAND	MOD	I		NEW					LS	1,872
DORMITORY AIRMEN		49		NEW	3,408	3,023	385	200	MN	467
DINING HALL AM	ADDN	400		NEW	66,324	30,224	36,100	4,399	SF	189
CHAPEL BASE		406		NEW	40,164	7,684	32,480	8,100	SF	277
UTILITIES		413		NEW					LS	40
ELECTRICAL DISTR SYS	MOD	414		NEW					LS	430
WATER SUPPLY STORAGE		53		NEW	1600,000	1000,000	600,000	500,000	GA	107
WATER SUPPLY		54		NEW	3,720	1,800	1,920	960	TD	76
WATER SUPPLY		55		149				960	TD	166

Offutt Air Force Base

The next location to be considered is Offutt Air Force Base. This installation is situated 1 mile southwest of Bellevue, Nebr. The planned use for this base is for headquarters of the Strategic Air Command, a Strategic Air Command tanker mission and other Strategic Air Command activities. The program requested for Offutt amounts to $3,826,000. The items are as follows:

The first item is a 2,116 square foot refueling vehicle shop. No structure is available for this purpose. An unheated canvas covered shelter is being utilized.

The next item provides for an additional 10,000 barrels of jet fuel bulk storage. The requirement for jet fuel storage at Offutt AFB is 54,915 barrels, with 27,834 barrels of existing storage at this base. The requested tankage will reduce the present deficiency.

The next item is for the modification of the existing command headquarters which provides for additional utilities and interior modification to accommodate components of the Strategic Air Command command and control system.

The next item is a dormitory to accommodate 200 airmen. The requirement is 3,408 spaces. Existing and under construction are 3,023 spaces, therefore this request will substantially alleviate a deficiency in dormitory spaces at this base.

The next item provides for an addition to the existing dining hall for airmen. The requirement is for 3,408 dining spaces. Existing and under construction are 1,800 spaces, and this request for a 400-man addition provides an increment toward satisfying the total requirement.

The next item provides a 300-seat chapel to be located in the vicinity of the Capehart housing development. The existing chapel facility, containing 300 seats, is located adjacent to the airmen dormitories. The requested chapel will only partially relieve the present requirement for 1,500 seats.

The next item provides support utilities to the new chapel included in this program. Construction will provide water and sewer mains for the chapel.

The next item is for the rehabilitation and modification of the existing electrical distribution system and installation of new circuits. As the base grew, additional electrical facilities were tied into the original system. Facilities programed and under construction will exceed the capacity of the present system and jeopardize the entire electrical power complex, placing the base in constant danger of total power failure.

The next item provides a 500,000 gallon underground water storage reservoir. There is storage for 1 million gallons of water existing at Offutt and this request will provide for the programed increase in base population, for fire protection and new construction on the base.

The next two items are for 960,000 gallons per day water supply each. The requirement for water supply at this base is 3,720,000 gallons per day. The existing 1,800,000 gallons per day and this request will provide the water required to support the mission at this base. Two of the four existing wells are becoming increasingly sterile and expected to become nonproductive in the near future.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop, refueling vehicles	District engineer	$5	30
Storage base jet fuel	do	5	100
Headquarters Command	Unknown	94	5
Dormitory, airmen	District engineer	23	30
Dining hall, airmen	Leo A. Daly Co	9	30
Chapel base	do	14	15
Utilities	District engineer	2	24
Electrical district system	do	22	30
Water supply storage	Henningson, Durham & Richardson	5	30
Water supply	District engineer	4	30
Do	Henningson, Durham & Richardson	8	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	PLATTSBURGH AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI NE PLATTSBURGH	GOVT OWNED	3,258
COUNTY, STATE	CLINTON, NEW YORK	OTHER ACRES	968
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,226
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	1812
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ MED BOMBARDMENT WG MED AIR REFUELING SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/MOT	BASE	TRANS/MOT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
908	22	5,320	18	6,268		294

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
144,000	61,365	71,802	10,833	80	10,753

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING APPROACH	559		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	80
									80

Plattsburgh Air Force Base

Plattsburgh Air Force Base is located 1 mile southwest of Plattsburgh, N.Y. Its planned use is for Strategic Air Command medium bomber and tanker missions.

The one item requested for this base amounts to $80,000 and provides for installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights (without strobeacon flashers) at the secondary end of the primary runway and is essential to the safe, regular and efficient operation of the mission at this base. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	St. John, Platt & Carlson	$6	60

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	TURNER AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	4 MI WSW ALBANY	GOVT OWNED	2,369
COUNTY, STATE	DOUGHERTY, GA	OTHER ACRES	197
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,566
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1940

PRINCIPAL MISSION
AIR DIV HQ
STRATEGIC WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ
HVY AIR REFUELING SQ
PHOTO MAPPING & CHARTING WG (MTC)
AAA MSLE BN (USA)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
709	27	4,130	34	4,900		586

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
45,000	20,991	15,035	8,974	2,676	6,298

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
PHOTO LAB		433	MTC	NEW	16,900		16,900	16,900	SF	474
TARGET INTEL TNG		I		NEW	4,000		4,000	4,000	SF	94
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C	MOD	I		NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	844
AUTO MAINT SHOP	DFRP	387		NEW	30,000		30,000	27,599	SF	432
SHOP REFUELING VEH		389		NEW	2,246		2,246	2,246	SF	54
STOR BASE JET FUEL		395		NEW	81,507	60,222	21,285	20,000	BL	71
DINING HALL AIRMEN	RPMT	402		NEW	34,362		34,362	7,904	SF	285
DINING HALL, AIRMEN	RPMT	401		685				14,190	SF	422
										2,676

Turner Air Force Base

Turner Air Force Base is located 4 miles east-northeast of Albany, Ga. Its intended use is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission and for the Military Transport Command mapping and charting activities. The program requested for Turner amounts to $2,676,000. The items include the following:

The first item is a photographic laboratory facility of 16,900 square feet to support the Military Transport Command mapping and charting activities. There is no existing facility which can be converted to satisfy the requirement of this special function.

The next item provides for a 4,000-square-foot target intelligence facility for the training of Strategic Air Command crew members so they can perform their assigned wartime duties.

The next item is for dismantling and moving two large aircraft maintenance docks from Donaldson to Turner and reerecting and modifying them to provide aircraft maintenance facilities to accommodate the heavy bomber and tanker aircraft. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item is for an automotive maintenance facility of 27,599 square feet. The four existing mobilization type structures consisting of approximately 17,133 square feet are beyond economical repair. Rehabilitation and maintenance costs of these buildings will be, and are, excessive.

The next item is a 2,246-square-foot refueling vehicle shop. Nothing exists at this base for accomplishment of this function. Vehicles are maintained outdoors.

The next item is for storage of 20,000 barrels of jet fuel. The requirement for storage is 81,507 barrels. Existing facilities and those under construction provide for 60,222 barrels.

The last two items provide for airmen dining hall space for 600 and 1,200 spaces, respectively, to replace the substandard and uneconomically repairable facilities. The requirement at Turner is for 1,909 spaces. There are no existing standard facilities. The existing substandard mobilization type facilities will be disposed of since they are beyond economical repair.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Photographic laboratory	District engineer	$24	95
Target intelligence training	do	5	10
Maintenance dock, large aircraft	ANC	42	40
Automotive maintenance shop	District engineer	22	45
Shop, refueling vehicle	do	3	40
Storage, base jet fuel	do	4	0
Dining hall, airmen	do	14	50
Do	do	21	90

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	VANDENBERG AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	8 MI SE LOMPOC	GOVT OWNED	63,730
COUNTY, STATE	SANTA BARBARA, CALIF	OTHER ACRES	1
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	63,731
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION

MSLE DIV HQ
STRATEGIC MSLE WG HQ
STRATEGIC MSLE SQ
INSTRUMENTATION SQ (ARDC)
MSLE TRNG SQ
AIR DEF MSLE SQ (ADC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
646	110	4,925	896	6,577		669

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
125,000	25,294	73,704	26,002	1,284	24,718

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP PARA & DINGHY		390		NEW	6,250		6,250	6,250	SF	184
WATER SUPPLY TREATMT	ADDN	52		NEW	9,000	6,000	3,000	3,000	TD	1,100
										1,284

VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE

The next location is Vandenberg Air Force Base. It is situated 8 miles northwest of Lompoc, Calif. The planned use of this base is ballistic missiles training, testing, and operations. The projects requested for Vandenberg in this program total $1,284,000.

The first item is for a 6,250-square-foot parachute and dinghy shop. The present lack of this facility necessitates a weekly airlift of between 50 to 75 parachutes to Norton Air Force Base for inspection and repacking.

The second item is for an addition to the present water treatment plant to provide an additional 3 million gallons of treated water per day. The existing water treatment plant has a capacity of 6 million gallons of water per day. However, subsequent additions to the mission, additional air-conditioning requirements and reevaluation of irrigation needs based upon a recently completed study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, have increased the requirement for treated water to 9 million gallons per day.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop, parachute and dinghy	District engineer	$9	3
Water supply treatment addition	Unknown	80	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	WALKER AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI N ROSWELL	GOVT OWNED	4,911
COUNTY, STATE	CHAVES, NEW MEXICO	OTHER ACRES	125
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,036
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942

PRINCIPAL MISSION

HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQS (2)
HVY AIR REFUELING SQ
STRATEGIC MSLE SQ
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)
AC&W SQ (ADC)
RADAR SAGE SQ (ADC)
AAA MSLE BN (USA)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
611	15	4,043	30	4,699		315

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
116,000	40,763	66,937	8,300	156	8,144

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TOWER, CONTROL	RPMT	384	NEW	1		1	1	EA	156
									156

Walker Air Force Base

Walker Air Force Base is located approximately 6 miles south of Roswell, N. Mex. The planned use of this base is for a strategic heavy bomber and refueler mission, a strategic missile mission, an Air Defense Command aircraft control and warning, and a fighter interceptor mission. This program for this base amounts to $156,000 and provides for a new control tower to replace the present one which is a modified open-frame forest ranger observation type tower. The present tower cannot be rebuilt or further modified sufficiently to provide the height or space for the equipment required in a modern tower.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Tower control	W. C. Kruger & Associates	$13	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	WESTOVER AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI SW CHICOPEE	GOVT OWNED	3,966
COUNTY, STATE	HAMPDEN, MASS	OTHER ACRES	214
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,180
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1939
PRINCIPAL MISSION	8TH AIR FORCE HQ AIR DIV HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQS (2) AIR REFUELING WG HQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ MED AIR REFUELING SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
1,278	56	5,263	53	6,650		659

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
97,000	72,060	15,447	9,493	177	9,316

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TOWER CONTROL	RPMT – 44		NEW	1		1	1	EA	177
									177

Westover Air Force Base

Westover Air Force Base is located 5 miles northeast of Chicopee Falls, Mass. Eighth Air Force Headquarters is located at Westover, and the principal flying missions are strategic heavy bombers, heavy and medium refueling aircraft and an air defense fighter interceptor unit.

The program for this base amounts to $177,000 and provides for replacement of the existing control tower, a substandard facility of only 255 square feet, located on top of a hangar. Visibility to the north end of the runway is very limited, making it difficult to control takeoffs and landing from that direction. The tower is considered unsafe in winds of 50-knot velocity or more.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Tower control	Unknown	$9	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	WHITEMAN AFB	GOVT LEASED	576
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI N KNOBNOSTER	GOVT OWNED	3,229
COUNTY, STATE	JOHNSON, MISSOURI	OTHER ACRES	673
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,478
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ MED BOMBARDMENT WG HVY AIR REFUELING SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/SQT	BASE	TRANS/SQT		NATIONALS	DAF
574	10	3,413	15	4,012		295

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
58,000	41,999	11,542	4,459	649	3,810

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY OVERRUN	212		NEW	44,444		44,444	44,444	SY	427
LIGHTING APPROACH	539		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	134
SHOP,REFUELING VEH.	540		149	2,116		2,116	2,116	SF	88
									649

WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE

Whiteman Air Force Base is located 2 miles south of Knobnoster, Mo. This base will accommodate medium bombers and heavy air refueling operations. The program requested for Whiteman Air Force Base totals $649,000 and contains three items:

The first item provides for construction of paved overruns at each end of the primary runway.

The second item is for installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights (without strobeacon flashers) at the secondary end of the primary runway and is essential to the safe, regular, and efficient operation of the mission at this base. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach. All landings concerned are with high-performance military aircraft.

The third item is a 2,116-square-foot refueling vehicle shop. Nothing exists at this base for accomplishing this function and the 20 refueling vehicles assigned to this base are maintained outdoors.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway overrun	District engineer	$21	30
Lighting approach	do	7	30
Shop, refueling vehicles	Turnbull-Novak, Inc	4	100

BLYTHEVILLE AIR FORCE BASE, ARK.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now let us turn to Blytheville Air Force Base, Ark.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	BLYTHEVILLE AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	4 MI SE BLYTHEVILLE	GOVT OWNED	3,067
COUNTY, STATE	MISSISSIPPI, ARK	OTHER ACRES	571
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,638
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
360	10	2,395	15	2,780		285

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
44,000	14,768	23,410	5,822	2,020	3,802

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
WASHRACK AIRCRAFT		330		NEW	1		1	1	EA	193
LIGHTING APPROACH		338		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	101
OPERATION MISS TNG		I		NEW	14,200	11,539	2,661	2,661	SF	77
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C	MOD	I		NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	491
SHOP REFUELING VEH.		344		149	2,196		2,196	2,196	SF	95
SHOP ARM & ELECT BAS	ADDN	357		NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	126
IE PAVE & GRNDS BLD		363		NEW	4,452		4,452	4,452	SF	97
IE MAINTENANCE SHOP		364		NEW	10,560		10,560	10,560	SF	233
STOR BASE JET FUEL		366		NEW	73,640	41,420	32,220	30,000	BL	104
COLD STOR..FOOD.BS.		370		149	3,340		3,340	3,340	SF	113
OQ MEN		I		NEW	87	52	35	24	MN	233
OPEN MESS NCO	ADDN	373		NEW	14,000	5,611	8,389	4,400	SF	157

BLYTHEVILLE AIR FORCE BASE

Blytheville Air Force Base is located 4 miles northwest of Blytheville, Ark., and the principal flying mission is strategic heavy bombers and heavy tanker aircraft. The program requested for Blytheville totals $2,020,000 which includes the following items:

The first item is a washrack facility. Frequent washing of the aircraft is necessary to eliminate corrosion, reduce drag, and aid in dissipation of heat from engines.

The next item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of standard approach lights at the secondary end of the primary runway and is essential to the safe and efficient operation of the mission. More than 35 percent of all landings use this runway approach.

The next item is a 2,661-square-foot operation mission training facility. This item is required to house the additional training instruments and devices scheduled for Blytheville. The complex aircraft and equipment now in use necessitate continuous training of both operational and maintenance personnel. Their use prior to actual flight enhances flying safety by insuring knowledge of normal and emergency procedures. Failure to provide sufficient training facilities results in an excessive loss of man-hours and operational capability. The existing 11,539 square feet and the requested facility will satisfy the 14,200-square-foot requirement.

The next item provides for the dismantling, moving, and reerection of two large aircraft maintenance docks from Donaldson AFB to Blytheville AFB. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item provides for a refueling vehicle shop. Maintenance on these vehicles is now being performed on an abandoned floor slab.

The next item is an addition to the existing armament and electronic shop providing additional storage and maintenance space required by complex electronic equipment installed in the heavy bomber aircraft.

The next item is an installation engineer pavement and grounds maintenance facility. There is no existing building that can be used for this purpose.

The next item provides for an installation engineer maintenance shop. This function is temporarily being performed in an installation engineer covered facility and in an installation storage shed. There are no other buildings existing which can be used for this purpose.

The next item will provide storage facilities for jet fuel. With the existing 41,420 barrels of jet fuel storage, this request for 30,000 barrels of storage will substantially satisfy the requirement for this facility.

The next item provides for a 3,340-square-foot cold storage facility for perishable foods. Six portable refrigeration units, located on the warehouse access ramp, are temporarily being used for this purpose.

The next item is a 24-man bachelor officers' quarters. Of a requirement for 87 spaces, 52 are existing. The requested quarters will still leave a deficiency of seven spaces.

The last item is an addition to the noncommissioned officers' open mess facility. The requirement for this facility is 14,000 square feet. The existing facility is only 5,611 square feet.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of desgr (thousands)	Percent completed
Washrack, aircraft	Unknown	$9	0
Lighting approach	do	5	0
Operation mission training	do	5	0
Maintenance docks, large A/C	AMC	25	100
Shop, refueling vehicle	Bruce R. Anderson	9	100
Shop, armament and electronic base	Unknown	6	5
Installation engineer, pavement and grounds building.	do	7	0
Installation engineer, maintenance shop.	do	15	5
Storage base, jet fuel	do	5	5
Cold storage, food, BS	Ginocchio-Cromwell & Associates	12	100
Officer quarters, men	Unknown	12	5
Open mess, NCO	do	10	5

OPEN MESS, NCO ADDN 373 NEW 14,000 5,611 8,389 4,400 SF 157

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for cold-storage facilities, officers' quarters, and the NCO club at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. For the cold storage plant, we are using six cold storage units located on an access ramp to the warehouse. These are too small, are deteriorated, and we are proposing to replace them.

For the officers' quarters we have an additional requirement for 35 spaces. We are proposing a 24-man officers' quarters to relieve the congestion.

For the open mess, NCO, we have an existing club of 5,601 square feet. We are proposing a 4,400-square-foot addition. This is in support of the SAC bomber mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is a portable operation, is it not, referring to the cold-storage operation?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have had them there a long period of time?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no way they can be replaced without this new construction?

Colonel PARKHILL. I do not believe so, sir. Most of the old boxes that are still around were provided during World War II, and in most cases they are deteriorated and need replacement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be done with these facilities if new ones are constructed?

Colonel PARKHILL. In the case of the cold-storage plant, the six portable refrigeration boxes will be disposed of.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are no longer usable at all?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. WHITTEN. I have no questions.

Mr. JONAS. What use is to be put on the land you propose to buy?

Colonel PARKHILL. For all four bases?

Mr. JONAS. Yes. Why do you need more land?

Colonel PARKHILL. Well, sir, we have real estate at Dow for the hospital. I believe I probably stated that wrong in the summary. I said utilities and real estate for four bases. It is utilities for three bases and real estate for one base.

Mr. JONAS. Do you have any land on which the hospital could be built?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir. The land is required to be purchased for this hospital.

Mr. JONAS. How much land is under our control at that base now? How many acres do we have?

Colonel PARKHILL. Total acres 2,513 for Dow. We are proposing to buy 11 acres for the hospital.

Mr. JONAS. At what price?

Colonel PARKHILL. $26,000. This is residential land, $2,363 per acre.

Mr. JONAS. Is it vacant land?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir; residential land.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. As I remember it, sir, there are two houses on this particular plot of land. They will come down the road and there are two houses on that block.

Mr. JONAS. Do you have a drawing or a map of the base?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. I do not have one with me, sir.

Colonel PARKHILL. I do not, either, sir. I will be glad to get it.

(Drawing of Dow AFB was separately provided to the committee.)

Mr. JONAS. Do you have any vacant land in the 2,513 acres that we already own?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. As to the siting I have a small map that might help.

Mr. JONAS. Is this entire block to be purchased? Are these the 11 acres? What other structures exist in that block now?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We had better get a site plan. This is not adequate to answer the question, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I am concerned with the necessity of buying additional land to build a hospital. We perhaps own enough land already.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We made a concentrated effort at this base to site the composite medical facility on base. This has been looked into repeatedly. We even went so far as to attempt to site the new facility on top of the existing facility, but it was impossible to site it and maintain any semblance of operation during construction.

The additional land is the only solution we can find.

Mr. JONAS. What is the bed capacity of the present hospital?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We are presently operating a 50-bed hospital.

Mr. JONAS. Is that to be demolished?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. If the existing structure were not in existence, would the vacant land where the present hospital is be adequate for the new one?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir. If we had the entire site of the existing facility vacant we could build a new facility on that site.

Mr. JONAS. What do you plan to put at the site of the present hospital when it is demolished?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. I do not know the answer to that, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Twenty-five hundred acres is quite a bit of land. Are you trying to get this land to fit a pattern?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. There are certain criteria that we follow in siting a medical facility.

Mr. WHITTEN. What are those criteria?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Primarily, sir, we try to stay away from the runways, a decent distance from the runways because of the noise and traffic pattern.

We try to stay at least 1,000 feet away from the runway. It is not a mandatory requirement but desirable.

We also try to locate the medical facility where it is readily accessible to both the flight line and the exterior road where possible so that in case you have emergencies on the highway they can be brought in, but primarily we try to locate them so they are readily accessible to the flight line.

Mr. WHITTEN. How firm is your estimate as to cost? Have you obtained an option on this land or is this your best guess?

Mr. GIBBENS. We have had a real estate planning report on Dow. The $26,000 estimate we feel is quite close. It would be anticipated we would probably get land for something under $25,000 so it would not require clearance.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all I have.

CASTLE AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up Castle Air Force Base, Calif.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	CASTLE AFB	GOVT LEASED	53
DIR TO TOWN	8 MI SE MERCED	GOVT OWNED	2,416
COUNTY, STATE	MERCED, CALIF	OTHER ACRES	397
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,866
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION

AIR DIV HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQS (3)
HVY AIR REFUELING SQS (2)
COMBAT CREW TRNG
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/MOT	BASE	TRANS/MOT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
760	325	5,353	95	6,533		333

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
59,000	47,512	4,538	6,950	2,678	4,272

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP, ARM & ELECT.	445	ADC	NEW	12,650		12,650	12,650	SF	300
STOR BASE JET FUEL	393		NEW	206,280	115,222	91,058	50,000	BL	240
COMP. MED. FAC.	DFRP I		NEW	51,873		51,873	51,873	SF	2,006
CHAPEL ANNEX	408		NEW	13,000		13,000	3,800	SF	132
									2,678

Castle Air Force Base

The next location to be considered is Castle Air Force Base situated 8 miles northwest of Merced, Calif. The planned use of Castle is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber unit, crew training for Strategic Air Command tanker crews and other Air Defense Command, Strategic Air Command, service missions. The program requested for Castle totals $2,678,000. It includes the following items:

The first item provides an armament and electronic repair shop for maintenance and repair of electronic equipment and accessories used in air defense fighter aircraft.

The next item will provide an additional 50,000 barrels of jet fuel bulk storage. Of the 206,000 barrel requirements, 115,222 barrels are existing. The requested tankage will reduce the present deficiency.

The next item provides for the construction of a 50-bed composite medical facility with 16-unit dental clinic and flight surgeon's clinic. The existing substandard 1941 contonment construction will be razed upon completion of this project.

The last item is a 3,800 square feet chapel annex which will be constructed in conjunction with an existing 250-seat chapel. There are no facilities available in which to properly conduct religious education.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop, armature and electrical	District engineer	$15	5
Storage base, jet fuel	Unknown	12	5
Complete medical facility	do	197	5
Chapel annex	do	7	3

Mr. Sheppard. What are you using for hospital facilities at this base at the present time?

Colonel Parkhill. We have a hospital, a cantonment type, which is badly deteriorated. This facility is about half of the required size.

Mr. Sheppard. What will be done with these facilities if the new one is constructed?

Colonel Parkhill. The existing cantonment-type hospital will be demolished.

Mr. Sheppard. What other Government facilities exist in this area?

Colonel Carmichael. Medical facilities, sir?

Mr. Sheppard. Yes.

Colonel Carmichael. In Merced City there is a Merced City Hospital, bed capacity 244, average daily census 195. Present occupancy rate is 79.9 percent.

Based on information from the local hospital administrator they project an average census for 1960 of 212 beds, which would give them an occupancy rate of 86.9.

There is a Mercy Hospital which presently has a 52-bed capacity, average census of 70, which is an occupancy rate of 134.6 percent.

There is at the present time a 32-bed addition under construction for the Mercy Hospital. With the addition the hospital administrator estimates an occupancy rate of 95.2 after completion of the addition.

Mr. Sheppard. What are the per bed costs exclusive of the flight surgeon and dental facilities?

Colonel Carmichael. The per bed cost is $26,000.

Mr. Sheppard. What is the status of the plans for this facility?

Colonel EDMONDS. We show only about 5 percent complete on that, Mr. Chairman.

General MINTON. This will be a hospital which will be site adapted.

Colonel EDMONDS. This 5 percent would indicate they have made the onsite preparations, getting ready for the site adaption.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And finalization and contract will be on the same procedure you testified about yesterday?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this project been fully approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On page 470 of the justifications I note the following language:

> This group breakdown is subject to change due to further refinements by the architect-engineers, development of working drawings, and review by the Bureau of the Budget.

Is that to be interpreted that we have a potential commitment here for this project or that we do not? Let us have a definite understanding.

In other words, if the Bureau of the Budget will jockey around with this you will not get the money. Let us clean it up fast.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. That statement means the total scope as you see it in the program and as authorized will not be exceeded at any time during design.

The breakout we show was an attempt to show the committee a little further how the scope based on utilization would be allotted within the facility and within the authorized scope.

The language with regard to the development of working drawings and review, we meant that in the development of the working drawings the exact scope shown for bed patient and the exact scope for outpatient facilities which might vary somewhat, but the total scope would not be exceeded.

The Bureau of the Budget enters into the picture in that at apportionment we have to take final working drawings with the request for apportionment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This interpretation is not to be construed as a ruling there will be a stop order on this.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. That is right, sir. They approve both at definitive and working drawing stages.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. WHITTEN. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. I figure this out to be $40,000 a bed instead of $16,000.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. That is taking the gross scope and gross cost.

At Castle I call attention to the utility cost of $320,000. The $26,000 per bed figure which I quoted is based on the building to the 5-foot line excluding the dental clinic and excluding the aviation medicine clinic.

COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE, MISS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now turn to Columbus Air Force Base, Miss.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	COLUMBUS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	10 MI SE COLUMBUS	GOVT OWNED	4,586
COUNTY, STATE	LOWNDES, MISSISSIPPI	OTHER ACRES	443
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,029
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	STRATEGIC WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
360	5	2,292	10	2,667		287

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 19 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
52,000	20,129	25,095	6,776	2,829	3,947

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
WASHRACK AIRCRAFT	DFRP 333		NEW	1		1	1	EA	141
LIGHTING APPROACH	340		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	97
OPERATION MISS TNG	I		NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	64
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C	I		NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	908
AUTO MAINT SHOP	DFRP 343		NEW	27,000	6,216	20,784	15,935	SF	381
SHOP ARM & ELECT BAS	ADDN 358		NEW	17,050	13,162	3,888	3,888	SF	101
STOR BASE JET FUEL	368		NEW	67,919	49,990	17,929	15,000	BL	128
WAREHOUSE BASE	ADDN 371		NEW	84,616	59,722	24,894	20,000	SF	143
DORMITORY AIRMEN	RPMT 372		NEW	1,156	1,207		200	MN	402
OQ MEN	I		NEW	87	49	38	24	MN	199
THEATER BASE	DFRP 374		NEW	9,275	3,663	5,612	9,275	SF	265
									2,829

Columbus Air Force Base

Columbus Air Force Base is located 10 miles northwest of Columbus, Miss. The planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission, including heavy air refueler aircraft. The program requested amounts to $2,829,000 and it includes the following items:

The first item provides for an aircraft washrack facility. The small existing facilities cannot be used to satisfy this requirement due to their size, strength of pavement and location. These facilities were originally constructed in 1941 to accommodate small trainer type aircraft.

The next item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights at the secondary end of the primary runway. These lights are essential to the safe, regular, and efficient operation of the mission. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

The next item is a 2,200-square-foot operational mission training facility required to house the necessary training instruments and devices. The complex aircraft and equipment now in use necessitate continuous training of both operational and maintenance personnel. Their use prior to actual flight enhances flying safety by insuring thorough knowledge of normal and emergency procedures.

The next item provides for two additional aircraft maintenance docks to accommodate large aircraft. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large-type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item is for the construction of a 15,935-square-foot automotive maintenance shop. Of the 27,000 square feet requested, only 6,216 square feet of substandard structures are available for this function.

The next item is for an addition to the existing armament and electronic shop to provide additional storage and maintenance space required by complex electronic equipment installed in the heavy bomber aircraft.

The next item will provide 15,000 barrels of additional storage facilities for jet fuel. The existing 49,990 barrels and this request will substantially satisfy the 67,919 barrels requirement.

The next item is an additional 20,000-square-foot base warehouse. The total requirement is 84,616 square feet. The existing 59,722 square feet of warehouse space will be continued in use to satisfy the requirement.

The next item will provide a 200-man dormitory to replace World War II mobilization type barracks that cannot be repaired or modernized economically. Of the 1,156 spaces required, 800 standard facilities are available. This request will substantially fill the requirement.

The next item provides for a 24-man bachelor officers' quarters. The requirement at Columbus is for 87 spaces. Existing are 49 spaces and this request will substantially alleviate the deficiency in quarters for bachelor officers.

The last item is for a 500-seat base theater. The existing 288 seat World War II, mobilization-type theater is in advanced stage of deterioration. It is beyond economical repair.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Washrack, aircraft	District engineer	$7	5
Lighting approach	do	6	5
Operational mission training	do	4	5
Maintenance dock, large aircraft	AMC	45	100
Auto maintenance shop	District engineer	22	30
Shop, armament and electronic base	do	6	5
Storage base, jet fuel	do	6	5
Warehouse, base	do	8	90
Dormitory, airmen	do	20	40
Officers quarters, men	do	10	40
Theater, base	do	15	40

You are requesting additional warehousing space, airmen dormitories, officers' quarters, and a base theater. What are you using for these facilities at the present time and what will be done with those that are there if the new ones are funded?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is for the proposed addition to the existing warehouse which is deficient. The dormitory item will replace a World War II mobilization dorm group. We propose to demolish these.

As to the officers' quarters, we have a 38-man deficiency and we propose a new 24-man officers' quarters.

As to the base theater we have a mobilization-type 288-seat theater which has been structurally condemned and we would propose to demolish this and replace it with a new 500-seat theater.

Did I answer it completely, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

How does this estimated cost of rehabilitation of the dormitories compare with the facility?

Colonel PARKHILL. Comparing the cost of rehabilitation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel PARKHILL. We have studied all of these projects and where we have found that dormitories are deteriorated because of termites or dry rot, or other basic reasons which generate a high rehabilitation cost, we propose to replace them.

General MINTON. We have a plan to modernize the dormitories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On page 499 of the justification I see the following language:

> They have been subjected to severe weathering and abuse during the period prior to SAC assumption of command of this installation and cannot be considered as assets capable of satisfying a portion of the end mission requirement without an extensive rehabilitation program estimated to cost at least $30,000 per building.

I presume the established figure is one you have checked in order to come up with this answer which appears in the justification. Is that correct?

General MINTON. Yes, sir; I am sure that is correct. I would like to know more what we mean by the word "rehabilitation," whether it means merely making the building structurally sound without doing anything to the inside of it.

If they mean by "rehabilitation"—and we estimate it will cost $35,000 to $38,000—to complete and modernize them, that is another question.

I would like, if I may, to have an opportunity to pursue this a little further and give you more information on it tomorrow morning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

Are you spending any funds in rehabilitating the base theater at the present time or any other buildings on the base?

General MINTON. I am certain we are. I will also get that information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will, please.

(The information requested follows:)

> The dormitories are World War II mobilization two-story frame buildings having a sleeping capacity in open bays of 37 men. Each building is heated by a manually stoked coal-fired furnace. There is a single community-type latrine in each structure. Since the buildings have been out of use for several years, with no maintenance moneys expended thereon, they have deteriorated very badly. The estimate of $30,000 rehabilitation will accomplish the following work:
>
> (*a*) Replace broken and rotted structural supporting members.
> (*b*) Replace necessary exterior siding.

(c) Replace and repair windows, doors, and trim as necessary.
(d) Replace and repair necessary roofing.
(e) Replace the manually coal-fired furnace with automatic oil-fired furnaces.
(f) Rehabilitate the electrical wiring system and provide adequate lighting for occupants.
(g) Repair and rehabilitate hot water heating system.
(h) Replace shower heads in the latrine.
(i) Seal the interior of the building with ⅜-inch gypsum board.
(j) Repaint the structure.

As a result, we would provide sleeping accommodations for 37 men in open bays on a minimal facility basis. The building life expectancy would be extended approximately 5 to 7 years.

There are no funds being spent to rehabilitate the base theater; however, there are two other rehabilitation projects—

(1) To convert the present aviation fuel aqua pumping system to a mechanical pumping system at a cost of $31,630;

(2) To rehabilitate an old squadron supply room so that it can be used as an interim measure to satisfy the requirement for a precision measuring equipment laboratory. The cost of this project is $8,300.

Mr. WHITTEN. In connection with this base, and it might apply to others, do you have any time limit for the operation of this base? Do you limit this type of construction to bases which you plan to operate for quite a number of years? Is there any general guide rule here?

General MINTON. In this case this is a strategic base, one of the new bases we just finished rehabilitating. It will be in the inventory as long as we have B–52 aircraft.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will you not substitute missiles?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Are you in a position to give any time limit on that?

General MINTON. I would like Colonel Liles to speak to that.

Colonel LILES. There is no time limit on a specific base, sir. It is carried through the program period.

Mr. WHITTEN. Which is 5 years?

Colonel LILES. At least 4 years, sir. We have no program on it beyond that time.

General MINTON. The B–52 itself carries far beyond that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Have you used that same type of yardstick in connection with the other projects and other areas?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Where is the nearest city of any size here? I notice it is 170 miles from Jacksonville and 176 miles from Memphis.

Colonel PARKHILL. Columbus Air Force Base is 10 miles from Columbus.

Mr. JONAS. How large is Columbus?

Colonel PARKHILL. 25,000 or 30,000.

Mr. JONAS. I asked these questions because of curiosity about the need to replace the base theater. You have 2,500 military personnel there?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You have a theater now but it is not adequate? You want to build one about double the size. Is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. The present theater is condemned. It has deteriorated.

Mr. JONAS. I notice it was condemned by the Motion Picture Service. I did not know they were in the business of condemning the-

aters. What do they know about structural features of a building?

Colonel EDMONDS. I am sure that was done on advice from our engineering people in the field.

Mr. JONAS. When you say it has been structurally condemned do you mean it is unsafe? Why did they condemn it? Just stating it was structurally condemned does not give us enough information.

Colonel EDMONDS. When we use that terminology ordinarily it is based on the fact that the structural members themselves have deteriorated to where we feel it is unsafe or will be within a short period of time.

Mr. JONAS. You state "This building is labeled substandard because of its size, capacity, and structural condition."

Are there any other facilities on the base for recreation?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. There is a gymnasium, the Officers' Club, NCO Club, but there is no other building that could be used for a theater.

Colonel EDMONDS. The existing building is an old World War II wooden type structure which is an extreme fire hazard for a motion picture theater in the first place, especially when when they are as old as that.

DOW AIR FORCE BASE, MAINE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall pick up Dow Air Force Base, Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	DOW AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI E BANGOR	GOVT OWNED	2,067
COUNTY, STATE	PENOBSCOT, MAINE	OTHER ACRES	446
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,513
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION

STRATEGIC WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ
MED AIR REFUELING SQS (2)
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)
AIR DEF MSLE SQ (ADC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
579	30	4,007	40	4,656		321

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY (BI) REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
93,000	36,227	45,850	10,923	3,160	7,763

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
LIGHTING APPROACH		378		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	128	
OPERATIONAL MISSION	ADDN	I		NEW	7,697	4,897	2,800	2,800	SF	70	
SHOP A/C MAINT FIELD		I		149	48,000	26,502	21,498	21,498	SF	384	R
SHOP A/C ENG INSP&RE	ADDN	I		149	25,780	9,912	15,868	15,868	SF	278	R
SHOP, ARM,&ELECT,	ADDN	22	ADC	NEW	12,650	5,814	6,836	6,836	SF	189	
WAREHOUSE BASE	ADDN	398		NEW	134,885	86,912	47,973	41,105	SF	298	
COMP, MED, FAC	DFRP	I		NEW	50,575		50,575	50,575	SF	1,787	
LAND FEE PURCHASE		I		NEW				11,000	AC	26	
										3,160	

Dow Air Force Base

Dow Air Force Base is situated in Bangor, Maine. The principal aircraft operating from Dow will be strategic heavy bombers and tankers and air defense fighter-interceptors. Dow will also support an air defense missile unit. The program requested for Dow Air Force Base totals $3,160,000.

The first item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights at the secondary end of the primary runway. These lights are essential to the safe and efficient operation of the high performance aircraft. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use in this runway approach.

The next item is a 2,800-square-foot operation mission training facility. This facility is required to house the training instruments and devices scheduled for the base. The complex aircraft and equipment now in use necessitate continuous training of both operational and maintenance personnel. Their use prior to actual flight promotes flying safety by insuring knowledge of normal and emergency procedures.

The next item is a 21,498-square-foot aircraft field maintenance shop. The requirement is 48,000 square feet. Existing standard and under construction is 26,502 square feet. The existing two substandard mobilization type buildings are programed for disposal since they are deteriorated beyond economical repair.

The next item provides a 15,868-square-foot addition to the 9,912-square-foot aircraft engine inspection and repair shop now under construction to provide the required 25,780 square feet to support all the aircraft assigned to this base.

The next item is an addition to the existing armament and electronics shop for maintenance and repair of electronic equipment and accessories used in the Air Defense Command fighter aircraft. The requested 6,836 square feet will satisfy the requirement for this facility.

The next item is a 41,105-square-foot addition to the existing warehouse. The requirement for warehousing is 134,885 square feet and existing standard facilities consists of 86,912 square feet. This item will essentially satisfy the requirement for warehouse space.

The next item is a 50-bed composite medical facility with 14 dental operating rooms. The present cantonment-type composite medical facility erected in 1941 as a temporary measure is beyond economical repair and must be replaced.

The last item is for the fee purchase of 11 acres of land to support the composite medical facility included in this program. No other suitable onbase land is available on which to site this facility.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	Unknown	$6	0
Operational mission	do	4	0
Shop A/C maintenance field	Alonzo J. Harriman, Inc	19	75
Shop A/C eng. insp. & re	Higgins, Webster, Pedersten & Tilney.	14	100
Shop, arm, & elect	Beal, DePeter & Spaulding, Inc	9	0
Warehouse base	Unknown	15	0
Comp. med. fac	do	89	0

Mr. Sheppard. What are you using for hospital facilities at the present time at this location?

Colonel Carmichael. At the present time we are using a World War II temporary cantonment type facility.

Mr. Sheppard. What is the cost per bed based on your present cost estimates without regard to the flight surgeon and dental operating facilities?

Colonel Carmichael. $26,700.

Mr. Sheppard. What will be done with the existing facilities if the new one is constructed?

Colonel Carmichael. They will be disposed of, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the final plans and specifications at this base?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The status is a standard 50-bed plan which will go under design. It has not been designed in the way of final working drawings at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The same procedure follows as heretofore?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has this been approved by all reviewing authorities although additional review of the final plans and specifications and scope will be required by the Bureau of the Budget?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The same answers apply to the previous question I asked with regard to this?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Identical with Castle, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the existing hospital facilities within the area?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We have civilian hospital facilities in the area. We have Bangor City with a bed capacity of 65, average daily census of 59. Present occupancy rate is 90.7.

Bangor State has 1,240 beds, average census of 1,168. Present occupancy rate is 94.1.

Eastern Main has a bed capacity of 297, average census 261, present occupancy rate 87.8.

St. Joseph bed capacity is 37, average occupancy 25, present occupancy rate 67.5.

Stinson Private bed capacity of 27, average census 15, present occupancy rate 55.5.

In addition we have 42 beds under construction at Eastern Main.

Additional information regarding the hospitals, sir:

Bangor City is a chronic disease hospital. Bangor State is a neuropsychiatric facility. Neither of those have any OB or delivery capability and cannot provide for dependents.

St. Joseph Hospital has no obstetrical department for deliveries.

Stinson Private has only seven beds available that could be considered an asset.

Eastern Main now is operating in excess of the 80 percent occupancy and incidentally this rate will continue above 80 percent after the 42 beds under construction are completed. Therefore, there is no civilian capability available to the Air Force personnel other than the very limited seven beds at the one small private hospital.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long would it take to construct this project once the contract is issued?

Colonel EDMONDS. Twenty-four months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. WHITTEN. I have no questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next we have Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	FAIRCHILD AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	12 MI ENE SPOKANE	GOVT OWNED	3,059
COUNTY, STATE	SPOKANE, WASH	OTHER ACRES	565
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,624
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ AAA MSLE BN (USA)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
512	10	3,623	15	4,160		452

EST TOTAL COST ($000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 ($000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($00)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($00)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($00)	FUTURE YEARS ($00)
128,000	77,841	39,606	10,553	5,951	4,602

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH FY	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($00)
RUNWAY, PRIM/INSTRUM	RPMT	I		NEW				103,000	SY	3,493
TAXIWAY, RUNWAY ACCE	RPMT	I		NEW				53,100	SY	1,596
LIGHTING APPROACH	DFRP	27		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	208
LIGHTING R-W NGCL		I		NEW	1		1	1	EA	350
CHAPEL, BASE		405		NEW	24,300	9,657	14,643	8,100	SF	304
										5,951

Fairchild Air Force Base

Fairchild Air Force Base is located 12 miles west-southwest of Spokane, Wash. Planned use of this base is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission, including heavy bomber and air refueler aircraft. The program request for Fairchild Air Force Base is $5,951,000. It includes the following items:

The first item involves the strengthening of the center portion of the primary runway which is showing signs of failure. With heavy bomber and tanker aircraft operations, this failure will accelerate substantially unless corrective action is taken.

The next item is for strengthening portions of the runway access taxiway which have shown definite indications of structural distress under the loads of the heavy bomber aircraft.

The next item will provide 3,000 feet of U.S. standard approach lights at the secondary end of the primary runway. This will be accomplished by converting existing substandard lighting and adding 1,522 feet of new lighting. Over 35 percent of all landings are made on this end of the runway.

The next item will provide narrow gage and centerline lighting for primary end of the instrument runway. This system is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely bad weather conditions.

The last item will provide a 300-seat chapel. Of the 900-seat requirement, 200 seats are provided in an existing mobilization type structure and another 100 seats in a converted administrative type building. This request will partially alleviate the deficiency.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, prim/ins rum	District engineer	$175	50
Taxiway, runway acce	do	80	50
Lighting approach	do	10	55
Lighting R-W NGCL	do	18	40
Chapel, base	Unknown	15	0

Tell us something with reference to the need for the replacement of this runway and taxiway system and the basis for your cost estimates.

Colonel PARKHILL. The present runway and taxiway were built as mediumweight pavement. They have been failing rapidly. We propose to put a centerline keel down the main runway and also keels with bituminous concrete for the sides on the main taxiways.

Colonel EDMONDS. The design is being done by the district engineer. It is about 50 percent complete.

Cost estimates are based on their like experience in the area of similar jobs plus their estimate of costs based on progress to date on the design.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I see in your justifications that the predicted runway life with the B–52 runway is from 10 months to 30 months. Are these items all in the same contractual category that we have discussed earlier, gentlemen?

Colonel EDMONDS. Advertised competitive bid, you mean?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel EDMONDS. Yes, sir.

FRANCIS E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Francis E. Warren Air Force Base is the next project that we shall consider.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	FRANCIS E. WARREN AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI E CHEYENNE	GOVT OWNED	7,459
COUNTY, STATE	LARAMIE, WYOMING	OTHER ACRES	1
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	7,460
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	1867
PRINCIPAL MISSION	AIR DIV HQ STRATEGIC MSLE WG		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
331	10	2,633	15	2,989		642

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 19 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
106,000	25,317	74,971	5,712	445	5,267

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
APRON, TRANSIENT RPMT	I		NEW	20,000	20,000		20,000	SY	445
									445

FRANCIS E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base is situated 1 mile west of Cheyenne, Wyo. The planned use of this base is for ATLAS intercontinental ballistic missiles under the operational control of the Strategic Air Command. Four hundred and forty-five thousand dollars is required to provide for the strengthening of the concrete aircraft parking apron and taxiway adjacent to the operational and terminal area at Cheyenne Municipal Airport. Since Francis E. Warren Air Force Base does not have a runway, it is necessary to use the Cheyenne Airport to fly the intercontinental ballistic missiles in heavy cargo aircraft.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Apron, transient	District engineer	$22	3

Why is it necessary to have a separate transient room facility for this base?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is a transient apron which is on the Cheyenne Municipal Airport. We are putting missile squadrons into Warren and we use the municipal airport to bring missiles and missile components in and out C–133 heavy-type aircraft. We need to strengthen this section of pavement for those aircraft.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much air logistics support will this base require?

Colonel PARKHILL. I do not have the facts on that, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Provide that for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

The present pavement at Cheyenne Muncipal Airport is of light duty and not of sufficient strength to support the load requirements of the Air Force. The logistic support plan for Francis E. Warren Air Force Base includes the delivery of all missiles and its allied components in our largest cargo-type aircraft. Also included in this plan is one aircraft per day delivering those items the depot normally supplies by air plus two additional scheduled aircraft per week as a cargo-courier run. The gross weights of each of the aircraft supporting this base is in excess of that which the present pavement is designed to withstand. The project in this program provides only the strengthening of the apron and taxiway that now shows signs of distress. Other areas of airport pavement will be used until signs of failure are evident and at that time required repairs and strengthening will be made.

GLASGOW AIR FORCE BASE, MONT.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now turn to Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	GLASGOW AFB	GOVT LEASED	4,039
DIR TO TOWN	16 MI SSW GLASGOW	GOVT OWNED	701
COUNTY, STATE	VALLEY, MONTANA	OTHER ACRES	849
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,589
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	

PRINCIPAL MISSION: STRATEGIC WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ
HVY AIR REFUELING SQ
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)
AIR DEF MSLE SQ (ADC)
AAA MSLE BN (USA)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
481	10	3,353	15	3,859		302

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
88,000	26,283	49,824	11,893	5,196	6,697

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
VEHICLE FUELING STA	DFRP	375		NEW	2	1	1	2	EA	37	
LIGHTING APPROACH		381		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	129	
OPER MISSION TRNG		I		NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	80	
SHOP A/C ENG INSP &R		I		149	26,280	10,900	15,380	15,380	SF	330	R
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C		I		NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	1,100	
AUTO MAINT. ADMIN		385		NEW	3,010		3,010	3,010	SF	122	
SHOP REFUEL. VEH		388		149	2,196		2,196	2,196	SF	101	
SHOP ARM & ELECT BAS	ADDN	359		NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	141	
AACS CONS MAINT		45		NEW	2,550		2,550	2,550	SF	104	
LAB. PREC MEAS EQUIP		I		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	65	
IE PAVE & GRNDS BLD		I		149	5,544		5,544	5,544	SF	173	
IE MAINTENANCE SHOP	ADDN	391		NEW	10,872	6,032	4,840	4,840	SF	153	
STOR BASE JET FUEL		394		NEW	86,890	60,186	26,704	25,000	BL	140	

IE MAINTENANCE SHOP	ADDN	391	NEW	10,872	6,032	4,840	4,840	SF	153
STOR BASE JET FUEL		395	NEW	86,800	60,186	26,704	25,000	BL	140

GLASGOW AFB SAC

STOR BASE S/ARMSAMMO		369	149	1,800		1,800	1,800	SF	54
COLD STGE FOOD BASE,	ADDN	I	149	4,315	1,588	2,727	2,727	SF	119
SHED, SUP & EQP, BAS		396	NEW	8,666		8,666	8,666	SF	73
HQ GROUP AIR BASE	ADDN	399	NEW	21,770	6,804	14,966	12,804	SF	438
HEADQUARTERS, WING		37	NEW	13,390		13,390	13,390	SF	453
OQ MEN		403	NEW	99	61	38	24	MN	250
CHAPEL, BASE & ANNEX	ADDN	407	NEW	21,340	3,840	17,500	5,600	SF	204
EXCHANGE SALES STORE	ADDN	51	NEW	10,692	4,992	5,700	5,700	SF	150
OPEN MESS, NCO	ADDN	I	NEW	14,000	6,500	7,500	7,500	SF	282
OPEN MESS, OFFICER	ADDN	I	NEW	14,000	6,500	7,500	7,500	SF	293
POST OFFICE, CENTRAL		411	NEW	3,750		3,750	3,750	SF	103
RCTN, LIBRARY		412	NEW	3,500		3,500	3,500	SF	102
									5,196

Glasgow Air Force Base

Glasgow Air Force is located approximately 16 miles northeast of the city of Glasgow, Mont. The planned use for this base is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomber mission, including heavy bombers and air tanker aircraft, an Air Defense Command fighter and a defense missile squadron.

The total program requested for Glasgow Air Force Base totals $5,196,000. All items contained in this request are deficiencies and there are no facilities existing which can be utilized for the functions involved.

The first item provides for a vehicle fueling station consisting of two gasoline pumps for all military vehicles on base.

The next item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. Standard approach lights (without strobeacon flashers) at the secondary end of the primary runway and is essential to the safe, regular, and efficient operation of the mission. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landing use this runway approach.

The next item is for a 2,200-square-foot operational mission training facility and is required to house the training instruments and devices scheduled for the base. The complicated aircraft and equipment now in use required the continuous training of both operational and maintenance personnel. Their use prior to actual flight enhances flying safety through insuring knowledge of normal and emergency procedures.

The next item provides a 15,380-square-foot addition to the 10,900-square-foot aircraft engine inspection and repair shop now under construction. This request will satisfy the requirement of 26,280 square feet to support all the assigned aircraft.

The next item provides for two additional large aircraft maintenance docks. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item provides for the construction of a motor pool administrative facility.

The next item is a 2,196-square-foot refueling vehicle shop which is required for the maintenance of the refueling vehicles on this base.

The next item provides for an addition to the existing armament and electronics facility to provide additional storage and maintenance space required by the more complex electronic equipment used by heavy bomber aircraft.

The next item is for a 2,550-square-foot consolidated electronics maintenance shop with administrative space to support the AACS detachment assigned to this base.

The next item provides for a 1,650-square-foot precision measurement equipment laboratory.

The next item is a 5,544-square-foot installation engineer pavements and grounds facility. This request will satisfy the requirement for this type of facility.

The next item is for a 4,840-square-foot addition to the 6,032-square-foot installation engineer maintenance shop to satisfy the requirement for performing this function.

The next item is for 25,000 barrels addition to the 60,186 barrels existing and programed jet fuel storage. This request will substantially satisfy the requirement for 86,890 barrels at Glasgow.

The next item is for a 1,800-square-foot base small arms ammunition storage facility. This request will satisfy the requirement for storage of 20-millimeter reserve and training ammunition as well as all other small arms ammunition. There are no existing facilities which can be utilized for the storage of this ammunition.

The next item is for a 2,727-square-foot addition to the existing 1,588-square-foot cold storage facility for perishable food. The existing cold storage facility was constructed to support the ADC mission. The size is inadequate to support the present mission.

The next item provides for the required 8,666-square-foot supply and equipment shed to store base supplies and equipment that are not authorized for open storage.

The next item provides for the addition of 12,804 square feet to the 6,804-square-foot existing airbase group headquarters to substantially satisfy the requirement for 21,770 square feet. The existing facility was constructed to support the Air Defense Command mission only.

The next item is for a 13,390-square-foot strategic wing headquarters facility. This item is required for approximately 100 personnel who will administratively control both bomber and tanker units known as a strategic wing. All records for both units will be kept in this building.

The next item provides a bachelor officers' quarters for 24 men. The requirement at Glasgow is for 99 spaces. Existing and now under construction are 61 spaces.

The next item is for construction of a 150-seat chapel addition to the existing 150-seat chapel and for construction of a 3,800-square-foot chapel annex. The requirement for a 600-seat chapel and 7,600-square-foot chapel annex is partially satisfied by this requirement.

The next item provides for a 5,700-square-foot addition to the existing exchange sales store to provide the required 10,692-square-foot facility.

The next two items are for a 7,500-square-foot addition to the noncommissioned officer mess and the officer open mess to provide for each, the required 14,000-square-foot facility.

The last two items provide a 3,750-square-foot base post office facility, and a 3,500-square-foot library facility.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Vehicle fueling sta	Unknown	$2	0
Lighting approach	do	6	10
Oper. mission trng	do	4	0
Shop, A/C eng. insp. & R	District engineer	17	90
Maint. dock large A/C	AMC	55	100
Auto maint. admin	Unknown	6	0
Shop refuel. veh	District engineer	5	90
Shop arm & elect. base	Unknown	7	0
AACS cons. maint	do	5	0
Lab. prec. meas. equip	do	3	0
IE pave & grnds Bld	District engineer	9	90
IE maintenance shop	Unknown	8	0
Stor. base jet fuel	do	7	90
Stor. base S/Armsammo	District engineer	3	90
Cold stge. food base	Unknown	6	
Shed. sup. & equip. base	do	4	0
Hq Group Air Base	do	22	0
Headquarters Wing	do	23	0
OQ men	do	13	0
Chapel base & annex	do	10	0
Exchange sales store addn	do	8	0
Open mess, NCO	do	14	0
Open mess, officer	do	15	0
Post office central	do	5	0
Rctn, library	do	5	0

At this installation you seem to have developed the usual happy faculty of the Air Force of increasing sharply the total estimated cost. Last year it was $72 million. This year it is $88 million. What is the reason for this increase?

Mr. GIBBENS. This year we have tried to come to a little better understanding as to the basis for our ultimate costs. We have revised and checked out our bases inventory costs up to July of 1959, added our programs to that, and then tried to look into the future without going completely to the old ones and coming up with a better figure at the end. Some of these have gone up and some have come down.

For instance, we have added our family housing this year. At Glasgow we had about $72 million last year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean Capehart is the proportionate part of this increase not included in the $72 million?

Mr. GIBBENS. That is right.

I will go a little further on that. The Capehart which we had in some of these bases had been added in some to the amount that the mortgage had been paid off. We felt we should add the total project into the cost and that is what we have done here. We have done that at all other bases where Capeharts are involved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you pursuing that course at all other bases of like character now?

Mr. GIBBENS. Yes, sir; we have gone through all the bases, particularly those in the program which would be coming to our attention.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you have at this base now for group administrative space?

Colonel PARKHILL. Headquarters group airbase, 6,804 square feet and that was originally built for the fighter interceptor squadron, and subsequent to that time we added the SAC bomber mission. We need to add 12,804 square feet to support the new SAC mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you presently using for an exchange store?

Colonel PARKHILL. The present exchange was built for the fighter interceptor squadron only. We need to add on to take care of the increased mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for officers clubs and NCO clubs?

Colonel PARKHILL. Here again the same situation prevails. We built these clubs for the fighter interceptor mission and with the increased bomber mission we propose to increase these two facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you have there for post office facilities?

Colonel PARKHILL. An officers' open mess, 6,500 square feet. Total requirement is 14,000 square feet. We propose to add 7,500 square feet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about library facilities?

Colonel PARKHILL. No library is available at this base, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your total personnel on the base and what are you planning to accommodate in the way of total personnel?

Colonel PARKHILL. Our presently projected strength with the two missions, the SAC bomber mission and the fighter interceptor mission, is 3,859. I believe a typical fighter interceptor strength would be around 1,500 people.

A fighter interceptor squadron would have 350 people plus base support, bringing it up to around 1,200 to 1,500 people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Over and above your present requirements and present workload. Is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Colonel PARKHILL. We will have around 2,200 people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item?

Mr. WHITTEN. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. Does this program you propose for 1961 involve $5,196,000?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You have in the offing for future years requirements of $6,697,000?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That will be about $11 million or $12 million still to be spent there. You are building up this base on land most of which is leased. What is the length of term of the leased acreage? Four thousand of your 5,000 acres there are leased. Is it not inadvisable to build up such a permanent establishment on leased land? Can you tell us something about the nature of the lease?

Mr. GIBBENS. Yes, sir; I am trying to remember that, sir. If my memory is correct—this goes back 2 or 3 years now—this is a long-term nominal lease from the State. I think it runs about 99 years.

Mr. JONAS. Would you mind putting something in the record explaining the nature and terms of the lease?

Mr. GIBBENS. I would certainly like to do that rather than refer to my memory.

Mr. JONAS. I would not want to see us build this installation up with a lot of permanent facilities and then have to abandon it one of these days because we could not renew the lease or purchase 4,000 or 5,000 acres there.

(The information requested follows:)

Glasgow AFB, Mont., comprises 5,590 acres. The land area leased at this installation consists of 4,039 acres at $3,800 per annum. The lessor is the State of Montana. The term of the lease is from May 1, 1955, to June 30, 2005. Therefore, because the Government has a right of continuous use for a minimum of 50 years, Department of Defense policy permits the construction of permanent type facilities on this leased land.

In addition to the above acreage, Glasgow AFB includes: (*a*) 80 acres of public domain land acquired at no cost by public land order in 1955; (*b*) approximately 341 acres donated by the Chamber of Commerce of Glasgow, Mont., in December 1953; (*c*) approximately 280 acres acquired by fee condemnation in September 1958 for title VIII Capehart Housing, with the total amount deposited with the court for this land amounted to $11,040; and (*d*) approximately 850 acres are utilized under permit from the Department of Agriculture at no cost.

LARSON AIR FORCE BASE, WASH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up Larson Air Force Base, Wash.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	LARSON AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI SSE MOSES LAKE	GOVT OWNED	8,563
COUNTY, STATE	GRANT, WASHINGTON	OTHER ACRES	40
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	8,603
COMMAND	SAC	DATE OCC	
PRINCIPAL MISSION	STRATEGIC WG HQ HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ HVY AIR REFUELING SQ STRATEGIC MSLE SQ SPOKANE EQ ADS (SAGE-ADC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
656	10	3,890	15	4,571		362

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
132,000	53,169	69,323	9,508	1,630	7,878

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
COMMUNICATIONS, BASE	ADDN	321		NEW	7,200	3,549	3,651	1,000	SF	37
FIRE STATION, BASE		382		NEW	18,361	12,467	5,894	5,894	SF	160
AUTO MAINT SHOP	DFRP	386		NEW	33,000	9,003	23,997	13,308	SF	247
WAREHOUSE, BASE	RPMT	397		149	141,710	20,706	121,004	41,000	SF	386
DORMITORY, AIRMEN	RPMT	50		NEW	1,960	1,344	616	400	MN	800
										1,630

LARSON AIR FORCE BASE

Larson Air Force Base is next to be considered and it is located 5 miles north-northwest of Moses Lake, Wash. The planned use of this installation is for a Strategic Air Command heavy bomb mission, Air Defense Command sector headquarters, and other Strategic Air Command and Air Defense Command activities. The program requested totals $1,630,000 and is composed of the following items:

The first item is a 1,000 square foot addition to the existing 3,549 square foot base communications facility. This addition is required for housing the additional communication equipment which supports the new Strategic Air Command mission programed for this base.

The next item provides for the construction of a four stall base fire station facility. There is an existing seven stall combination base and line fire station near the flight line. This new fire station in this request will be located to protect the housing and hospital areas of the base.

The next item is a 13,308 square foot automotive maintenance shop. The requirement for this facility is 33,000 square feet. Existing is a usable facility of 9,003 square feet and two theater-of-operation type structures, totaling 12,128 square feet, constructed during World War II. These latter buildings are considered to be beyond economical repair. Construction of this shop will partially alleviate the deficiency of shop space needed for efficient operation.

The next item is a 41,000 square foot base warehouse. The requirement is 141,710 square feet. Although 135,538 square feet exist, all of this space is substandard. The 17 theater of operations, tar paper covered buildings, consisting of 114,832 square feet were constructed in 1942 and 1943 and are not economically repairable. Another structure consisting of 20,706 square feet is a converted Butler-type steel hangar located on the flight line. This request will provide an increment of the warehouse requirement at Larson Air Force Base.

The last item provides for a dormitory to house 400 airmen. The requirement is 1,960 spaces. Present standard accommodations existing consists of 1,344 spaces. Present standard accommodations existing consist of 1,344 spaces. Existing theater-of-operation type structures built during World War II now handle 712 spaces. These substandard buildings will be demolished as they become vacant.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Communications, base	Doudna, Williams & Phipps	$2	20
Fire station, base	Unknown	8	50
Auto maint. shop	do	12	20
Warehouse, base	Culler, Gale, Martell & Morris	19	85
Dormitory, airmen	Unknown	40	20

What are you using for warehouse and dormitory space at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. For warehouse we propose to replace 17 widely scattered World War II temporary-type buildings constructed originally as dormitories, warehouses, and general maintenance structures. We propose to demolish these. The dormitory we propose here would replace the World War II temporary-type barracks which would be demolished.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the cost of rehabilitation and, if this work is approved, what will be done with the existing facilities?

Colonel PARKHILL. The existing facilities are proposed to be demolished. Here again, this is a case where we have selected certain types of temporary barracks which are beyond economical rehabilitation, and we would propose to replace only those.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, rehabilitation is an impractical investment here; is that it?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

WURTSMITH AIR FORCE BASE, MICH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, the Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	WURTSMITH AFB	GOVT LEASED	2,324
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI SSE OSCODA	GOVT OWNED	2,005
COUNTY, STATE	IOSCO, MICHIGAN	OTHER ACRES	356
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,685
COMMAND	SAC		
		DATE OCC	1926

PRINCIPAL MISSION
AIR DIV HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT WG HQ
HVY BOMBARDMENT SQ
HVY AIR REFUELING SQ
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ADC)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
445	10	2,750	15	3,220		297

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
78,000	24,714	43,546	9,740	3,269	6,471

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST			
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)	
CORROSION CON FAC CV		326		NEW	1		1	1	EA	400	
LIGHTING APPROACH		341		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	FT	57	
OPERATIONS, SQUADRON		I		149	8,700		8,700	8,700	SF	186	
OPERATIONS MISSION T		I		NEW	30,000		30,000	30,000	SF	684	
SHOP A/C MAINT FIELD	ADDN	I		149	48,000	33,700	14,300	14,300	SF	255	R
SHOP A/C ENG I&R	ADDN	I		149	26,280	11,069	15,211	15,211	SF	240	R
MAINT DOCK LARGE A/C		I		NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	977	
SHOP ARM & ELEC	ADDN	360		NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	168	
OXYGEN GEN PLANT		I		149	1,600		1,600	960	SF	23	
COLD STOR FOOD BAS	DFRP	I		NEW	6,610	2,820	3,790	3,292	SF	114	
STORE COMMISSARY	ADDN	39		NEW	14,600	7,600	7,000	7,000	SF	165	
										3,269	

WURTSMITH AIR FORCE BASE

The next location to be considered is Wurtsmith Air Force Base which is located approximately 3 miles north-northwest of Oscoda, Mich. The planned use of this base is for Strategic Air Command heavy bomber and refueling missions and an Air Defense Command fighter mission. The total program being requested for Wurtsmith amounts to $3,269,000 and includes the following items:

The first item is a covered corrosion control facility to be used for washing aircraft. Frequent washing eliminates corrosion, reduces drag, and aids in the dissipation of heat from engines. The washing facility must be a covered structure at this base due to the severe winter conditions in the region.

The next item is for installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. standard approach lights (without strobeacon flashers) at the secondary end of the primary runway. The lights are essential to the safe, regular, and efficient operation of the mission at this base since more than 35 percent of all aircraft landings are at the secondary end of the runway.

The next item provides for a 8,700-square-foot squadron operation facility to support the tanker mission at Wurtsmith.

The next item provides for the construction of a 30,000-square-foot operational mission training facility to provide space to house the heavy bomber and refueler simulators and mobile training units; one ECM trainer; one gunnery trainer; and one cockpit procedure trainer. The complex aircraft and equipment now in use requires facilities to train Air Force personnel on a continuing basis.

The next item provides a 14,300-square-foot addition to the presently existing and under construction 33,700-square-foot aircraft field maintenance shop. The requirement for this facility is 48,000 square feet. This requested facility will fill the aircraft maintenance shop deficiency.

The next item is for a 15,211-square-foot addition to the existing 11,069-square-foot aircraft engine inspection and repair shop. The requirement for this facility is 26,280 square feet and the requested facility, together with the existing facility, will provide the required facility to support the SAC and ADC mission at Wurtsmith.

The next item provides for two additional aircraft maintenance docks to accommodate large aircraft. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large-type maintenance docks. Four of these docks were included in a previous program. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item provides for an addition of 4,650 square feet to the existing armament and electronic building to provide additional storage and maintenance space required by the more complex electronic equipment used in the heavy bombardment aircraft.

The next item provides for a 960-square-foot prefabricated-type building to accommodate one diesel-driven liquid oxygen generating plant which is required to supply breathing oxygen for the aircrews flying in the assigned aircraft. The requirement for this facility is 1,600 square feet and this request will reduce the deficiency. No other facility is available for this purpose.

The next item is for a 3,292-square-foot cold storage facility for perishable subsistence required to support the programed personnel strength of the installation. This request, together with the existing facility, will provide an adequate cold storage facility.

The last item is an addition of 7,000 square feet to the existing 7,600-square-foot commissary store. This item is required to support the 618 units of family housing now under construction.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Corrosion con. fac	District engineer	$20	0
Lighting approach	do	3	0
Operations, squadron	do	10	100
Operations mission	do	34	0
Lox gen plant	do	1	100
Shop A/C maint. field	Giffels & Rossetti	19	100
Shop A/C eng. I & R	District engineer	12	100
Maint. dock large A/C	AMC	49	100
Shop arm and elec	District engineer	10	0
Cold stor. food base	do	6	0
Store commissary	do	9	0

Here we have a series of line items. What are you using for commissary facilities here at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is another base which we originally built up for a fighter-interceptor squadron. We provided a commissary, 7,600 square feet. Now to support the added SAC bomber mission, we propose to add an additional 7,000 square feet to bring it up to the requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many hours per day is it open to actual purchases by the customers?

Colonel PARKHILL. Colonel Urbach, how many hours a day are these commissaries open for business?

Colonel URBACH. Usually 6 to 8 hours a day. I do not know the specific hours on this base, but it is usually 6 to 8 hours per day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, provide a definite answer to that, will you, please?

(The information requested follows:)

The hours of operation for the Wurtsmith commissary are as follows:

	Hours
Monday: 1100 hours to 1800 hours	7
Tuesday: 1100 hours to 1800 hours	7
Wednesday: 1100 hours to 1800 hours	7
Thursday: 1100 hours to 1800 hours	7
Friday: 1100 hours to 2000 hours	9
Saturday: 0900 hours to 1300 hours	4
Total	41

Twice a month on payday regardless of the workday it falls on, the commissary store remains open from 0900 hours to 2000 hours.

The distance from the base to the nearest adequate civilian store is 3 miles and no commercial transportation is available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish at this point you would list in the record all other commissary requests reflected in this program.

(The information requested follows:)

Commissaries are included in the Department of the Air Force fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation request as follows:

Base	Size (square feet)	Cost
K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Mich	10,000	$254,000
Kingsley Field, Oreg	7,494	197,000
Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak	7,742	200,000
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich	7,000	165,000
Wakkanai Air Station, Japan	3,500	35,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much of the increase in cold storage space relates to the increased commissary space?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is of course directly in support of the commissary and the dining hall. I do not have a breakdown between the two. We propose to add to the existing facilities to satisfy the SAC mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. I would like to pursue the question of the chairman about the period during the day when you have commissaries open. This is for additional commissary space at this base.

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Why can you not expand the use of the existing commissary by increasing the period of time it is open and save building additional space? Is it open on Saturday, for example?

Colonel URBACH. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. How long?

Colonel URBACH. Usually the entire day, because that is one of the big-volume days.

Mr. JONAS. I visited a commissary at an Air Force base last fall and found it closed on Saturday. It was not even open. That is the busiest shopping day for civilians. What hours during the day? You say 6 hours a day. Why can it not stay open all day?

Colonel URBACH. Many of the schedules are brought about by personnel staff limitations.

Mr. JONAS. You do not use airmen to run the commisaries. You use civilians; do you not?

Colonel URBACH. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Are you keeping these commissaries open just 6 hours a day because of inability to employ people to keep them open longer? I never heard of a civilian grocery store staying open only 6 hours a day. As a matter of fact, they are now opening after supper and staying open until 7 or 8 o'clock at night in order to give customers an opportunity to shop after they get off from work. What is the justification for keeping the commissaries open only 6 hours?

General MINTON. I think, Mr. Jonas, Colonel Urbach should get a bit more information on this. I know in many cases our commissaries are open at night. When I was a base commander, I kept it open at night. On Saturday it was open from 8 o'clock to 2 o'clock in the afternoon. We ran our commissary an average of about 10 hours a day.

Mr. JONAS. Would it not be cheaper to hire a few more people to keep the commissary open all day instead of building a new one?

General MINTON. I think the big problem, Mr. Jonas, in this particular case and, in general, would be the shelf space for the volume that you would have to handle. On this particular base we have 618 Capehart units under construction and 330 units ready for contract. That will increase the requirement for the commissary far beyond what it would be if there were just a normal increase in base military strength.

Mr. JONAS. That would depend on how much storage space you had in the commissary and how frequently you had to draw provisions from a central warehouse.

General MINTON. Yes, sir. That varies, too, because in many cases the storage space is in a warehouse that is trucking distance from

the commissary rather than having the storage space in the commissary.

Mr. JONAS. I think the committee would like to have more specific information justifying keeping commissaries open only 6 hours a day.

General MINTON. We shall provide that.

(The information requested follows:)

Hours of operation for commissary stores are established by the commander concerned, based upon his operational requirements and manpower ceiling and fund limitations imposed. Manpower criterion is based upon dollar sales per month. In order to afford the maximum opportunity to commissary sales store patrons, commanders are encouraged to keep stores open after normal duty hours.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have received complaints and sent letters to the commanding officer at Millington Naval Base in Memphis, Tenn. Apparently there were numerous grocery stores available in that area. The commanding officer insisted on large commissaries, a large stock. The local merchants endeavored to convince him that they had plenty of availability in big, modern grocery stores, located convenient to the base. The commanding officer came back and said that cheap groceries were part of the fringe benefits of military service, and it had no connection with just providing these services where it was inconvenient and where it needed to be on the base for the convenience of the people, but that groceries at cost were a fringe benefit for the military.

I have those letters written to these people in private enterprise who had invested their money in these large grocery stores.

What is the attitude of the services? Is this commissary business an effort to give fringe benefits, or do you limit your planning to provide such commissaries where the base is located some distance from regular stores selling at regular prices? What is the criteria for this? It disturbs me particularly because I have been on this committee a long time, and I did not know what this was supposed to be. When you keep your commissary open 6 hours and build another commissary so as not to keep the one commissary open, there are at least two or three questions. First, you may be trying to give these fringe benefits far beyond what is practical, if that is it. The idea would occur to me that if you worked more than 8 hours you might have to work your help a little more. Therefore, you might have to reflect it in the price of the groceries. So to keep the groceries below what would be the normal cost, you get the Government to put up another commissary so you can run each one of them 6 hours. If you got down to 4 hours, you would undoubtedly require three or four commissaries. It could reach the point of being ridiculous. I raise these points so you can give the other side, if there is one.

General MINTON. I believe the base referred to is a Navy base.

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe it is.

General MINTON. Our Air Force policy is a combination of the two factors you bring out. It is, of course, a fringe benefit. I think the law requires that we sell our items in our commissaries at about 20 percent less than surrounding territory.

Mr. WHITTEN. It does not require you to have them unless Congress goes along with providing them.

General MINTON. That is correct, exactly. The other requirement as you bring out, is a fringe benefit. There is no question about that.

Mr. WHITTEN. What if you were to decide that you wanted to run

these commissaries only 4 hours, would you ask us for money to build two or three more commissaries?

General MINTON. No, sir. And at the committee's request I would like to get some additional information on the hours. I do not have definite information at this time. Our general practice in the Air Force is that our commissaries are open a considerably longer average time than 6 hours a day. If that is not a fact, we will furnish it to you.

Mr. WHITTEN. In this particular case, how close are you to private stores?

General MINTON. Wurtsmith is a pretty isolated location up in northern Michigan. Just how far it is from the nearest large town, I am not certain. We can get that information and supply it.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

(The information requested follows:)

Wurtsmith Air Force Base is located 25 miles from Oscoda, Mich., the nearest large city. There is an A. & P. store located in Oscoda and an IGA store 2 miles closer, 23 miles from the base.

CLINTON COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

Mr. SHEPPARD. My next inquiry does not have to do with the projects under consideration at the moment, but with a project under consideration and considered a definite requirement in last year's budget, for some $3 million. I have received a communication under date of April 7, signed by Joseph T. Kingsley, Jr., brigadier general, U.S. Air Force, Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison:

Knowing of your interest in Air Force activities, the Secretary has asked me to inform you of the following recent developments in Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio.

The Air Force Reserve mission is planned to continue for the foreseeable future. Rather than assigning 2 squadrons of KC–97 tankers to the base beginning this summer we now plan to stage in 12 to 15 KC–97's. These aircraft and their crews will not be permanently assigned but will remain for a staging period and then be relieved by other aircraft and crews.

There are other paragraphs having to do with the fact that the base has been reduced in its requirements, even including the hospital.

What is the explanation, gentlemen, for the change of planning within the Air Force, if you know, or was this an objective assigned to the Air Force by DOD? What is the story back of this situation, if you please?

General MINTON. Mr. Chairman, this is part of our constant review of our base program to be certain that we are not overbuilding and overprograming our bases. At the time we programed this base about 3 years ago in the supplementary 1958 program, there was a long-range requirement for KC–97 aircraft at this base. We have been constantly reviewing it and, as a result of the review and the more rapid phaseout of the KC–97 to reflect the more rapid phaseout of the B–47's which they support, it became possible to reduce the activities of this base to the extent you pointed out and, as a result of that increased activity, we have been able to cut back considerably on the construction. We have stopped all new construction at the base. We have ample facilities to take care of the aircraft now programed in to the base. We cut out the housing project. There was something

in the neighborhood of about $3 million worth of Capehart housing, as I recall it, to be built there. We stopped that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There were 686 units of Capehart.

General MINTON. About $5 million or $6 million worth of housing, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note in the fifth paragraph:

From a manning standpoint, we expect to have in excess of 1,200 military personnel and civilian employees at Clinton County Air Force Base, after commencement of the Strategic Air Command tanker operation, which is planned for July of this year. The exact breakdown of military and civilian employees is now under study.

Do you know whether or not that study has been consummated, and have you any determinable factors or established figures?

General MINTON. I do not know, but I am certain it has not been completed yet. We will check that and, if those figures are available, we will furnish them to you.

(The information requested follows:)

Evaluation of the manpower requirements at Clinton County AFB, Ohio, has been recently completed. By July 1960, the manpower authorized will be:

Military	1,289
Civilian	478
Aggregate	1,767

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Jonas, have you any questions on that or the letter?

Mr. JONAS. Yes; I have one or two on this.

When was it decided to cut back operations in Clinton County?

General MINTON. The actual decision was made within a matter of the past 3 or 4 weeks. It had been under study for several months.

Mr. JONAS. What did we have in the program last year for Clinton?

General MINTON. Roughly $3 million.

Mr. JONAS. Read the items, please, that were requested last year for Clinton.

Mr. SUFIT. The items in the 1960 request were a hospital; dormitory, airmen; open mess, NCO; open mess, officer; and utilities—for an amount of $3,932,000. This was the Air Force request.

Mr. JONAS. How many of those items will be unnecessary now as a result of this cutback?

General MINTON. All of them except the GCA, is that not correct? The only thing we are going to build is the GCA and a dispensary.

Colonel EDMONDS. I believe there is a part of the utility item that may be required to take care of some of the structures which were under construction at the time.

Mr. JONAS. What is the extent of the construction that you stopped?

Colonel EDMONDS. It has not been started.

General MINTON. None of this had been started. All the construction that had been started had been funded in 1959.

Mr. JONAS. What were those items?

General MINTON. The big items were runway facilities, ramps, and so forth, which we had to have with the KC–97's. We could operate only one airplane off it anyway.

Mr. JONAS. You mean no money has been spent on the hospital?

General MINTON. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. For plans or architectural and engineering work or anything?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Design was stopped on that facility when we first heard that there was some question about the size of the Clinton County Base.

Mr. JONAS. What about the airmen and officers' facilities?

General MINTON. Design money was spent on those. Those were site adaptations for barracks and whatnot, and the amount of money was comparatively small.

Mr. JONAS. Why could we not have known last year that this cutback would occur?

General MINTON. It was just part of the Air Force program in cutting back on the B–47's, which, of course, resulted in the reduced requirement for tankers, KC–97's.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield to me, that is one of the things I find difficult to develop in the record here. We have so many requests for military construction based on an overall plan of some years ago as to what you want to have a perfect setup eventually. Then, as has been testified in times past, you come up each year within the limits of the money that the Bureau of the Budget and Defense Department allow you to ask us for, and each year you ask for an increment on a plan prepared some years ago. Then we try to tie that back to a military program which is changing. It appears to me as if we run into far too much of this kind of thing. In other words, there seems to be a lack of common knowledge between your Department and those responsible for projecting future planning in our military defensive and offensive patterns. Most of these proposals are increments toward an overall plan to further develop the base. That has been in the testimony for numbers of years.

Following that pattern in the one field leads, I think, to constructing facilities which sometime prove surplus, with wasted money because you later find out the other crowd in the military, in the Air Force, have a different plan and you do not need this. I do not know what can be done to improve it. As I said to you the other day, I am not referring to you, because I think you do a good job, General, within the limits of your area. It does appear to me that we are sometimes heading in two directions at one time, all of which is very expensive.

General MINTON. If I may say a word on that, Mr. Whitten. As I mentioned yesterday, we have a military construction panel which reviews all our construction. This panel consists of representatives from each one of the interested staff agencies, and included on that panel is the senior representative from the plans office. Any time we make a change in our military construction plans, as the Clinton County project was a change, it is an Air Force change, a change in Air Force position. As I believe I mentioned yesterday, before we award a contract for any major portion of our construction, we clear once again through this panel and in turn, of course, with our planning people and operations people to be certain that nobody has even a gleam in their eye concerning changes in requirements.

Mr. Whitten, we could have placed most of these items in Clinton County under contract several months ago, but there was a little suspicion at that time. Any time there is any suspicion at all——

Mr. WHITTEN. I know you do not want to spend money needlessly. I know you would not enter into contracts for needless construction knowingly, but I just wonder how well they keep you informed. Could we have for the record how much has been spent at this base for the last 3 or 4 years?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let us see how far behind this segment is from planning or how quickly the planning judgment has changed. Let us have that by years for the record.

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Obligations

Fiscal year:	*Thousands*
1955	$365
1956	1,207
1957	1,684
1958	9,934
1959	10,609
1960 (actual through March)	1,354

Mr. JONAS. I have one other question. I notice in the hearings last year, Mr. Kinter stated that the Capehart housing bids were already opened, had been opened on April 30, and when asked why the contracts had not been let, he said, "There has just not been enough time." Were the contracts ever awarded?

General MINTON. No, sir, they were never awarded. In fact, the low bidder could not qualify. He could not get finance money. The next lowest bidder was too high on his bid within the statutory limitations. So we did not have a responsive bidder in that case.

Mr. JONAS. You did not go out for additional bids?

General MINTON. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You must have known, then, a year ago.

General MINTON. No. We went over the plans and specifications again to be sure that we would get a responsible bidder, a reliable bidder, who could bid within the statutory limitations we had. Those plans and specifications were ready to be advertised about January 1 of this year. At that time we held them up. We had a tremendous amount of pressure to go ahead, but they were held up because there was a bit of suspicion about this base. We did not know in April of last year; no, sir.

Mr. JONAS. The original bids were opened on April 30, 1959, and it was not until January 1960 that you completed new specifications and were ready to advertise?

General MINTON. Yes, sir. You see, we were not in any hurry because we had lost the summer construction season anyway. We cannot do any construction in Ohio during the winter. Our best time to advertise these bids for housing or for any of our construction in the North is along in December and January. We get the prospective construction people before they have their summers work laid out.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If anyone here knows, was the change in procedure made necessary by reduction of budgetary requirements, reduction in operations or shifting of operational requirements?

General MINTON. This was absolutely a case of shifting operational requirements. Our requirements for KC–97's became slightly less and our requirements for other missile systems became greater.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now taking up the Tactical Air Command, please insert in the record at this point the summary table on page 633 of the justifications.

(The table follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Cannon Air Force Base	TAC	1,021
England Air Force Base	TAC	1,250
Luke Air Force Base	TAC	1,914
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base	TAC	222
Nellis Air Force Base	TAC	1,356
Pope Air Force Base	TAC	423
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base	TAC	,104
Total		8,290

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have a summary statement to present, I understand.

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. For the Tactical Air Command we have a program of projects for seven bases totaling $8,290,000.

The special high-cost projects are as follows: Cannon Air Force Base, runway replacement, $1,021,000; Luke Air Force Base, aircraft maintenance docks; $1,284,000; Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, aircraft maintenance docks, large, two $700,000.

Other projects: Airfield pavement for three bases, approach lights for three bases, aircraft ready shelters for one base, special weapons training for one base, aircraft maintenance facilities on three bases, armament and electronic shops on two bases, various maintenance facilities on three bases, supply facilities on two bases, a wing headquarters for one base, airmen dormitory and dining hall for one base, and recreational facilities for two bases.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The appropriate data with reference to the projects which we shall not take up specifically will be placed in the record at this point.

(The data follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:MYRTLE BEACH AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI NE MYRTLE BEACH	GOVT OWNED	: 4,415
COUNTY, STATE	:HORRY, SO CAROLINA	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 4,415
COMMAND	:TAC		
		DATE OCC	: 1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:TAC FTR WG		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	OAF
410	41	2,801	56	3,308		326

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
25,000	19,752	1,665	3,583	222	3,361

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
PAD WARMUP-HOLDING	ADDN	541		NEW	16,400	2,670	13,730	5,000	SY	70
LIGHTING APPROACH	MOD	216		NEW	3,000	500	2,500	2,500	FT	152
										222

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base

The next base to be considered is Myrtle Beach Air Force Base which is located 1 mile southwest of Myrtle Beach, S.C. The mission of this base is a tactical fighter wing. The program requested amounts to $222,000 and consists of two items:

The first item will provide two 2,500 square yards warmup holding pads as additions to the present 1,335-square-foot pads. These additions are necessary to safely accommodate the century series aircraft and simultaneous allow passage of other aircraft on the taxiway.

The second item will provide for the installation of a standard approach lighting system which is an essential operational requirement for modern high-speed aircraft. Approximately 500 feet of the existing 1,500-foot system can be modernized and incorporated in the standard system of 3,000 feet requested in this program.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Pad warmup, holding addn	District engineer	$3.5	15
Lighting approach mod	do	7.6	25

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:ENGLAND AFB	GOVT LEASED :	9
DIR TO TOWN	:5 MI E ALEXANDRIA	GOVT OWNED :	2,231
COUNTY, STATE	:RAPIDES PARISH, LA	OTHER ACRES :	1,310
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	3,550
COMMAND	:TAC	DATE OCC :	1943
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:TAC FTR WG AIR REP SQ FTR INTERCEPTRO SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
339	20	2,927	8	3,294	78	330

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
34,000	23,710	4,663	5,627	1,250	4,377

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY OVERRUNS		549		NEW	66,667	19,166	47,501	14,166	SY	170
LIGHTING APPROACH	MOD	550		NEW	3,000	500	2,500	2,500	FT	306
A/C SHELTER READY		65	ADC	NEW	7		7	2	EA	218
SHLTR A/C WEAPON CAL		10	ADC	NEW	3,840		3,840	1,920	SF	64
SHOP AMMO BASE		552		149	2,400		2,400	2,370	SF	74
SHOP ARM&ELECT BASE	RPMT	442	ADC	NEW	25,050		25,050	12,650	SF	272
COLD STOR FOOD BASE	DFRP	554		NEW	4,315		4,315	4,315	SF	146
										1,250

England Air Force Base

The next base to be considered is England Air Force Base which is located 5 miles west of Alexandria, La. The mission of this base is a tactical fighter wing, air refueling squadron, and fighter interceptor squadron. The program requested amounts to $1,250,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item is for an 850-foot paved overrun at northwest end of the primary runway. Considerable damage to aircraft has been experienced that could have been avoided had the overruns been paved. With the assignment of high performance fighter aircraft, this project becomes even more critical.

The second item will provide a standard 3,000-foot approach lighting system. This project is required to provide an adequate all weather approach lighting system.

The third item will provide two ready aircraft shelters to support the century series aircraft assigned to this base. This project will protect the sensitive electronic equipment from moisture, heat, and dust, thereby decreasing the chances of malfunction.

The fourth item for a weapons calibration shelter is required to calibrate radar and missile guidance systems whenever components of the system are changed and when periodic inspections and unscheduled maintenance is required. The average rainfall of 52.7 inches with average wind gusts of 20 to 25 miles per hour warrants a closed shelter.

The fifth item provides a 2,370-square-foot base ammunition shop for the processing surveillance, maintenance, modification, assembly, and disassembly of all types of ammunitions and explosives used in support of the base mission.

The sixth item provides a 12,650-square-foot armament and electronics shop to maintain and repair the sensitive equipment and accessories on the century series aircraft. The extreme sensitivity of this equipment requires a dustproof and moistureproof building. This building will replace a 14,285-square-foot unusable building.

The last item will provide a 4,315-square-foot cold storage building. This project will replace a 3,600-square-foot unusable theater-of-operations type structure beyond economical repair.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway overruns	District engineer	$8.5	5
Lighting approach mod	Unknown	15.3	5
A/C shelter ready	do	10.9	5
Sultr A/C weapon cal	do	4.5	5
Shop ammo base	Roberts & Barksdale	8.0	100
Shop arm & elect base RPMT	Unknown	13.6	50
Cold stor food base DFRP	do	7.3	5

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:POPE AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:3 MI ESE SPRING LAKE	GOVT OWNED	: 29
COUNTY, STATE	:CUMBERLAND, N.C.	OTHER ACRES	:1,662
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:1,691
COMMAND	TAC	DATE OCC	:

PRINCIPAL MISSION: TRP CARR ASSAULT WG

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
397	53	2,234	69	2,753		292

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
18,000	16,187	74	1,739	423	1,316

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP A/C MAINT ORG	DFRP	546		NEW	24,000	9,520	14,480	14,480	SF	223
SHOP A/C PERIODIC MT		547		NEW	4,800		4,800	3,386	SF	53
SHOP COMM& ELECT BSE	DFRP	548		NEW	7,850		7,850	7,850	SF	147
										423

POPE AIR FORCE BASE

The next installation to be considered is Pope Air Force Base which is located near Spring Lake, N.C. The mission of this base is for a troop carrier assault wing. The program requested amounts to $423,000 and consists of the following:

The first item is for a 14,480-square-foot aircraft maintenance shop which will replace a 6,234-square-foot unusable building and will provide required space for maintenance of assigned aircraft.

The second item is for a 3,386-square-foot aircraft periodic maintenance shop which will provide space needed for maintenance of aircraft now being performed in tents.

The last item is for a communications and electronic shop necessary to provide a dust and moistureproof building in which to conduct maintenance and repair of sensitive equipment on assigned aircraft.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop A/C maint org DFRP	District engineer	$11.0	35
Shop A/C periodic MT	do	2.7	40
Shop comm & elect bse DFRP	do	7.3	40

CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now pick up Cannon Air Force Base, N. Mex.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	CANNON AFB	GOVT LEASED		OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
DIR TO TOWN	7 MI ENE CLOVIS	GOVT OWNED	3,460							
COUNTY, STATE	CURRY, NEW MEXICO	OTHER ACRES	55	BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,515	477	7	3,072	6	3,562		323
COMMAND	TAC	DATE OCC								
PRINCIPAL MISSION				EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)	
	2 TAC FTR WGS			34,090	19,752	3,473	10,865	1,021	9,844	

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY, PRIMARY/INST	RPMT	533		NEW				133,333	SY	1,021

REVISED: 11 APRIL 1960

CANNON AIR FORCE BASE

Cannon Air Force Base is located 7 miles west southwest of the city of Clovis, N. Mex. The mission of this base is the support of two tactical fighter wings. The program requested amounts to $1,021,000 and consists of one item.

The existing 10,000-foot primary/instrument runway consists of two 1,000-foot portland cement concrete end sections and an 8,000-foot center section of bituminous pavement. This center portion is rapidly becoming unusable and this item will provide for complete replacement of the bituminous center portion.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, primary/inst	Wilson & Co	$51.0	5

How long do you anticipate you could use the existing runway without this additional replacement?

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, very recent studies indicate that we must do this replacement work this coming winter. We had originally felt that we could go in and repair part of the runway to carry us on, but recently an additional study has indicated that the runway is failing quicker than we anticipated, and we feel it urgent that we do this work this coming winter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How firm is the tactical fighter mission for this facility?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is a firm mission, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was this item included in the original budget program?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why not?

Colonel PARKHILL. This was a late starter. We had initially thought we could do it with O. & M. funds by doing patchwork rehabilitation, but subsequent to that time the amount of deterioration was considered too extensive for that, and we must include it in this program.

LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next is Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:LUKE AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI N LITCHFIELD PK	GOVT OWNED	:2,373
COUNTY, STATE	:MARICOPA ARIZONA	OTHER ACRES:	365
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES:	2,738
COMMAND	:TAC		
		DATE OCC	: 1941

PRINCIPAL MISSION: ADVANCED FLYING SCHOOL (FTR)
COMBAT CREW TNG WG (FTR)
AIR DIV HQ (SAGE)
PHOENIX AIR DEF SECTOR (SAGE)

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
598	42	3,122	1	3,763		1,245

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
29,000	17,158	4,025	7,817	1,914	5,903

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
PAD ARM& DISARMING	ADDN	215		NEW	24,997	3,886	21,111	12,000	SY	185
MAINT DOCK SMALL A/C		217		NEW	14	8	6	6	EA	1,284
OPEN MESS OFFICER	DFRP	221		NEW	14,000		14,000	14,000	SF	445
										1,914

Luke Air Force Base

The next base to be considered is Luke Air Force Base which is located 1 mile north of Litchfield Park, Ariz. The mission of this base is for an advanced fighter flying school, a combat crew training fighter wing, and the Phoenix Air Defense Sector (SAGE). The program requested amounts to $1,914,000 and consists of the following:

The first item will provide a 12,000-square-yard arming and disarming pad as an addition to the existing 3,886-square-yard pad. This pad is necessary to provide a safe, functional location wtihout jeopardizing the cantonment area during ammunition handling.

The next item will provide six small maintenance docks to provide sheltered maintenance space for assigned aircraft. During summer months with 105° to 115° temperatures, it is impossible to perform maintenance on aircraft in the open due to extremely hot metal surfaces of aircraft.

The last item will provide a 14,000-square-foot officers' open mess to provide an adequate recreational and dining facility for the officers and their dependents. This building will replace a 7,625-square-foot old World War II field ration mess building.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Pad arm and disarming add	District engineer	$9.3	5
Maint dock small A/C	Air Materiel Command	40.0	100
Open mess officer DFRP	Unknown	22.3	1

There are three line items here. What are you using for an officers' club at this facility at the present time?

Colonel Parkhill. The officers' club burned down last year, and we were able to use temporarily a small World War II type messhall for a club in the interim period, with the plan to put in for a new standard club in this program.

Mr. Sheppard. Why did you not reconstruct the building after it was destroyed by the fire? From your justifications, you consider it a rather important requirement.

Colonel Parkhill. Sir, it burned clear to the ground.

Mr. Sheppard. I know it burned to the ground, but I am asking, why did you not rebuild?

Colonel Parkhill. We felt that by temporarily using this messhall we could carry through a short period of time until we could do this in the military construction program.

Mr. Sheppard. You did not have available a reprograming possibility?

Mr. Gibbens. Mr. Chairman, we do have ability to replace items which are destroyed by fire, acts of God, or otherwise. We can do that from O. & M. funds. In the case of buildings which are urgently required for operational needs or for some other good and valid reason, we would go ahead. We normally are restricted to building the same type and at approximately the same cost. On something like an officers' club where we would be replacing a World War II facility, which undoubtedly would have cost much less than we would have to spend now, we feel that we should come in the regular, normal construction program.

Mr. Sheppard. I think there would be some factor indicating which avenue you pursue based upon the estimated cost, that is, the cost as

of the time of construction of the building versus the cost at present. What has been the price index increase in the area for which you are requesting this fund in the past years?

Colonel EDMONDS. About 3 percent has been the general average increase, Mr. Chairman. We would have to go back to the prices in the days when the old World War II structure was built to compare the costs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You might have to go back for the original cost, but so far as the price index is concerned at the time the building was destroyed, whatever it was, your price index for construction purposes was X dollars per square foot. The question is directed to the difference between that time and the present time, the lag between then and now. You had ample funds to accomplish the end result, and I am trying to find out, gentlemen, what the delay in replacement has cost, if it has cost anything. I would like to have that question answered in the record.

(The information requested follows:)

LUKE AIR FORCE BASE

There was no delay in initiating replacement of this facility, therefore no cost due to delay has been experienced. This fire, on January 11, 1959, destroyed a multiple substandard facility and it is the Air Force position to replace such facilities, where at all possible, with standard adequate permanent construction. The only means for accomplishing this type of construction is through a military construction program. Such a restoration project exceeds the criteria for utilization of O. & M. funds.

The cost index for Luke Air Force Base has increased approximately 2 percent during the past year.

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEV.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, Nellis Air Force Base, Nev.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:NELLIS AFB	GOVT LEASED :	113
DIR TO TOWN	:8 MI SW LAS VEGAS	GOVT OWNED :	4,304
COUNTY, STATE	:CLARK NEVADA	OTHER ACRES :	15
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	4,432
COMMAND	:TAC	DATE OCC :	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:COMBAT CREW TNG WG FTR WEAPONS SCHOOL AIR DEMONSTRATION FLT		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
388	210	3,125	205	3,928		1,507

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
42,000	34,249	1,559	6,192	1,356	4,836

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
DORMITORY AIRMEN	DERP	555		NEW	1,768	1,286	482	266	MN	557
DINING HALL AIRMEN	DERP	556		NEW	31,078	12,668	18,410	14,704	SF	495
CLUB SERVICE		557		NEW	19,800		19,800	12,700	SF	304
										1,356

NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE

The next installation to be considered is Nellis Air Force Base which is located 8 miles northeast of Las Vegas, Nev. The mission of this base is for a combat crew training wing, fighter weapons school, and air demonstration flight. The program requested amounts to $1,356,000 and consists of the following:

The first item is for two 133-man dormitories to provide 266 airmen spaces. There is a requirement for 1,768 spaces with 1,286 spaces existing of which 1,230 are usable substandard. This project will replace old World War II barracks located within the high noise range of jet aircraft on ramps and runways.

The next item provides a 14,704-square-foot airmen dining hall for 1,000 men. There is a requirement for 1,768 men, and a usable substandard building of 12,668 square feet (700 men) is existing.

The last item provides for a 12,700-square-foot service club to permit a satisfactory recreation program for airmen and their families. This project will replace an existing unusable building.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Dormitory, airmen, DFRP	District engineer	$28	4
Dining hall, airmen, DFRP	....do	25	4
Club service	....do	15	90

There are three line items. What are you using for existing dormitory, dining hall, and service club space here at the present time, and what will be done if the new items are funded?

Colonel PARKHILL. For the dormitory we are presently using some World War II mobilization-type barracks which are located very close to the apron. With the introduction of the jet aircraft subsequent to this construction, the noise problem is very excessive. The buildings have deteriorated. We propose to demolish them.

Regarding the dining hall, we propose to replace a 400-man temporary messhall with a 1,000-man dining hall to satisfy the deficiency, and we would demolish that structure.

The service club would also replace a World War II facility which is one quarter the required size. In this case we would propose to use the old building, to convert it and use it for a bowling alley.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

(No response.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. I note these three items are in priority classification of 555, 556, and 557.

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. These, of course, are replacements and do not fall into the category of our first grouping of high-priority operational items, although we feel that all three of these are good requirements.

(Off the record.)

SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE, N.C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall turn to Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, N.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:2 MI NNW GOLDSBORO	GOVT OWNED :	3,108
COUNTY, STATE	:WAYNE, N.C.	OTHER ACRES :	1,032
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	4,140
COMMAND	TAC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION:	TAC FTR WG BOMB (HVY) SQ AIR REF (HVY) SQ FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
822	21	5,492	35	6,370		508

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
83,100	43,584	26,293	13,223	2,104	11,119

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TNG SPECIAL WEAPONS		218		NEW	2,840		2,840	2,840	SF	86
SHOP A/C ENG INSP&RE		I	SAC	149	52,488	28,718	23,770	18,970	SF	338 R
MAIN DOCK LARGE A/C MOD		I	SAC	NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	700
AUTO MAINT SHOP	ADDN	551		NEW	33,000	18,946	14,154	14,154	SF	239
SHOP ARM & ELEC	ADDN	361	SAC	NEW	17,050		17,050	4,650	SF	114
SHOP GRND POWRD EQUI		220		NEW	15,000		15,000	5,000	SF	123
SHOP GRND PWD EQUIP		31	SAC	149	15,000	5,000	10,000	5,000	SF	123 R
STOR BSE JET FUEL		553		149	137,931	60,000	77,931	20,000	BL	96
WHSE FLYAWAY KIT BASE		543		NEW	15,225	9,425	5,800	6,000	SF	69
HQS., WING		38	SAC	NEW	10,000		10,000	10,000	SF	216
										2,104

SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE

The next installation is Seymour Johnson Air Force Base located 2 miles northwest of Goldsboro, N.C. The mission of this base is a tactical fighter wing, heavy bombardment squadron, heavy air refueler squadron, and fighter interceptor squadron. The program requested amounts to $2,104,000 and consists of the following:

The first provides for a 2,840-square-foot weapon training building required for the various weapons associated with F–105 aircraft. No existing facility is available for this function.

The next item provides an 18,970-square-foot aircraft engine inspection and repair shop. The existing facility is not sufficient to effectively support the assigned mission.

The next item provides two large maintenance docks. Adequate maintenance of the aircraft at this base has established a requirement for a total of seven large-type maintenance docks. Two of these docks were included in a previous program and there are two existing docks which are adequate for this purpose. There will be a deficiency of one dock to be included in a future program.

The next item provides a 14,154-square-foot addition to the present auto-maintenance shop. The lack of sufficient area to house the modern shop equipment is critical. Crowded conditions in the present building require all heavy maintenance on large equipment to be performed outside.

The next item provides a 4,650-square-foot addition to the present 12,400-square-foot armament and electronics shop. This addition is required for maintenance on new, modern and complex electronic systems in heavy aircraft.

The next item provides a 5,000-square-foot ground-powered equipment shop to house powered and nonpowered ground support equipment in support of the Tactical Air Command mission aircraft.

The next item provides a 5,000-square-foot ground powered equipment shop to support the Strategic Air Command's mission aircraft. These two items will satisfy two-thirds of the base requirement.

The next item provides a 6,000-square-foot flyaway kit warehouse. Flyaway kits are composed of necessary spaces and special equipment to maintain aircraft for periods of 30 days away from home base.

The next item provides 20,000 barrel base storage for jet fuel. Existing 60,000 barrels JP–4 storage is not sufficient to support the base mission. Provision of this item will still leave a deficit of 57,931 barrels.

The last item provides for a 10,000-square-foot wing headquarters building to support the Strategic Air Command mission. There are no existing facilities available for this type function.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Tng special weapons	District engineer	$4.3	50
Shop A/C eng insp and Re	do	16.9	10
Maint dock, large A/C	AMC	30.0	100
Auto maint shop addn	District engineer	12.0	20
Shop arm and elec addn	do	5.7	0
Shop grnd powrd equip	do	6.0	0
Do	do	6.0	0
Stor bse jet fuel	do	4.8	95
Whse flyaway kit bse	do	3.5	35
Hqs., wing	do	10.8	50

Mr. SHEPPARD. What happened to the total estimated cost here which increased from $54.3 million in fiscal year 1960 to $83.1 million in fiscal year 1961?

Mr. GIBBENS. I am sure the same thing happened here, Mr. Chairman, that we talked about before. From the $54 million that we had in 1960 to the $83 million here, we have defined our inventory costs, we have added family housing in the amount of $15 million, and we have added facilities in the amount of $3 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The cost factor is not chargeable completely to the price index increase, but to additives in structural requirements?

Mr. GIBBENS. That is right. These are not due to cost factor increases.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your answer is "No," it is not. It is due to the additional structures you are going to build under the $83.1 million as against what was contemplated under the $54.3 million.

Mr. GIBBENS. That is correct, sir.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we come to the Aircraft Control and Warning System. Please place the summary sheets appearing on pages 668 and 669 in the record at this point.

(The summary sheets follow:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Adair Air Force Station SDC-13	ACW	$227
Antigo Air Force Station	ACW	65
Baker Air Force Station	ACW	174
Bartlesville Air Force Station	ACW	151
Baudette Air Force Station	ACW	30
Belleville Air Force Station	ACW	175
Bullen Point DEW Station	ACW	270
Burns Air Force Station	ACW	61
Cross City Air Force Station	ACW	30
Crystal Springs Air Force Station	ACW	489
Custer Air Force Station	ACW	112
Demarcation Bay DEW Station	ACW	55
Eufaula Air Force Station	ACW	30
Flintstone Air Force Station	ACW	97
Fordland Air Force Station	ACW	120
Fortuna Air Force Station	ACW	125
Fort Fisher Air Force Station	ACW	70
Guthrie Air Force Station	ACW	183
Hancock Field, Syracuse, N.Y.	ACW	78
Hastings Air Force Station	ACW	832
Highlands Air Force Station	ACW	224
Joelton Air Force Station	ACW	220
Lake City Air Force Station	ACW	170
Las Vegas Air Force Station	ACW	241
Makah Air Force Station	ACW	122
Mica Peak Air Force Station	ACW	154
Mount Hebo Air Force Station	ACW	350
North Bend Air Force Station	ACW	111
Richmond Naval Air Station	ACW	125
Sioux City Municipal Airport	ACW	63
Snow Mountain Air Force Station	ACW	181
Stewart Air Force Base	ACW	245
Thomasville Air Force Station	ACW	30
Topsham Air Force Station	ACW	85
Walnut Ridge Air Force Station	ACW	115
Winnemucca Air Force Station	ACW	159
Radar improvement	ACW	10,000
Gap fillers	ACW	2,000
SAGE	ACW	12,200
SAGE gain's	ACW	4,582
Total		34,751

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may present your general statement.

Colonel PARKHILL. I can call off the categories here.

For aircraft control and warning inside the United States, we have a total program involving 36 sites and 4 package programs, at a total cost of $34,751,000.

The special and high-cost projects are as follows:

First, Project SAGE. This includes, first, $2,700,000 for conversion of two SAGE direction centers to combat centers, including support facilities. Second, $7,500,000 for construction of five manual control centers, including support facilities. Third, $2 million for base support facilities for the 32d Air Division. This total project adds up to $12,200,000.

The next package program is radar improvement, frequency diversity, radar towers, electric power, utilities, and real estate, $10 million.

Next, operations buildings additions for processing of radar data and transmission to the SAGE centers, $1,321,000.

Then, SAGE ground-to-air transmitter-receiver buildings at 21 ACW sites, $4,582,000.

Sixteen gap filler sites, $2 million.

At Hastings, Nebr., which is a new site, it is proposed to complete the ACW site at a former naval ammunition depot. The construction would include ground-to-air transmitter-receiver buildings, operations building, rehabilitation of available family housing, and rehabilitation of a composite support facility and utilities. The total bill for Hastings would be $832,000.

At Crystal Springs, Miss., we propose 27 units of family housing out of appropriated funds.

Then we propose trailer courts for privately owned trailers at seven ACW sites.

Other projects are water and sewage facilities at 12 sites, airmen dormitories at 2 sites, recreational facilities at 1 site, fire stations at 2 sites, dispensaries at 2 sites, auto maintenance and storage facilities at 4 sites, approach lights at Stewart Air Force Base, and various miscellaneous small facilities at 4 sites.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What items in this program were not contained in the original budget submission? What is the reason for their addition?

Mr. GIBBENS. Mr. Chairman, the items that were not included in our original budget program were under Project SAGE. The $2.7 million for the conversion of the two SAGE direction centers to combat centers, including support; $7½ million for construction of five manual control centers; and a change on the $2 million for base support facilities for the 32d Air Division. We originally had about $1,300,000 in for specific facilities at Dobbins Air Force Base for this particular activity in connection with the super-SAGE which we are going to put in that vicnity. We have not completely determined whether this will stay at that particular base or be used at some other base in the general area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are going to discuss SAGE in detail at a later place in the program, but you are mentioning it here as a component part. Go ahead.

Mr. GIBBENS. These will be base support facilities.

We did add $2 million to the SAGE ground-to-air transmitter-receiver building for an additional 12 locations. I believe that is about all that we actually added.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, if you find something else should be added in, in response to the question, put it in.

(The information requested follows:)

There are no other items to be added to the aircraft control and warning program at this time.

EFFECT OF ELIMINATION OF BOMARC B SQUADRON ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR A.C. & W. STATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What effect would the elimination of all BOMARC B squadrons have on this appropriation for A.C. & W. stations? Can you answer that question at the moment?

General MINTON. We cannot give a specific answer at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you place the answer in the record in detail?

General MINTON. This will be part of our study which we hope to have at the end of these hearings.

(The information requested follows:)

If all BOMARC B squadrons were eliminated, detailed technical and operational studies of the air defense system would be required to determine the effect upon the fiscal year 1961 A.C. & W. appropriation request. These studies would cover redeployment of the fighter interceptors, operational role of the BOMARC A, low-altitude surveillance requirements for the weapons remaining, and communications requirements. A detailed answer would not be available until the completion of such studies. However, generally there would be some reduction to the ZI A.C. & W. GATR package and to the Canadian gap filler package.

WATER SUPPLY FOR MOUNT HEBO AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the water supply being developed for the Mount Hebo Air Force Base?

I think you will find that on page 744 of the justifications, gentlemen.

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. Do you want an explanation of that, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. I want to know if the water supply is being developed for the base and will be available for the Air Force and is it geared to the supply of your requirements and not that of any other State or local agency or personnel.

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. We propose to develop a new water supply which will be exclusively for our use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is apparent from the justifications, gentlemen, that you are presently getting water from a small creek and that creek within itself is not able to supply the demand. What procedure will be pursued in development of this water? Are you going to depend on the creek or put a dam in?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir. We propose to go to another creek and develop that, where we would have prior water rights, as opposed to where we now have our water supply located, we are subject to prior rights of other users.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are not going to walk into something that the Navy walked into in Falbrook, Calif., when it comes to riparian rights, because when you start doing that, whether in California or any other State, you walk into a legal problem, and a lot of people start giving you a bad time. If you are going into a creek operation, it seems to me there has to be some very careful study made of this.

What do you personally know about this project, General, insofar as riparian rights, et cetera? If seems to me, depending on a creek and contending with riparian rights, a very costly legal thing could develop if you have any adversity of opinion of those riparian owners.

General MINTON. I am not familiar with this, sir. Normally these sites are up on top of a mountain or something of that sort and, rather than tampering with the creek, it might be better to dig a well even if we had to pipe water 2 or 3 miles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am merely calling your attention to this situation, when you walk into riparian rights.

General MINTON. We will look at this again and be certain.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You had some experience with riparian rights up in Massachusetts.

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would make a very concerted research of this or have it done by someone.

General MINTON. I will do it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not want you to hold the record up for this answer. I do want that information supplied to us at as early a stage as you can.

(The information requested follows:)

The matter of riparian rights has been investigated. This is a relatively primitive area and the State of Oregon has granted permits for use of downstream water for irrigation of pastures to five individuals. It is considered that downstream tributaries will adequately satisfy the requirements of these five permittees. The Air Force will obtain necessary permits for the use of this water from the Oregon State engineer upon approval of the item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

CARIBBEAN AIR COMMAND

HOWARD AIR FORCE BASE, C.Z.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the Carribean Air Command, we shall turn our attention to Howard Air Force Base, C.Z.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

				OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
STATION	HOWARD AFB	GOVT LEASED		BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAF
DIR TO TOWN	4 MI NE BALBOA	GOVT OWNED								
COUNTY, STATE	CANAL ZONE	OTHER ACRES	4,237							
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,237							
COMMAND	CAC									
		DATE OCC	1954							

PRINCIPAL MISSION

TRANSITION FLYING
SUPPORT WESTERN HEMISP RESERVE
TRAINING FLTS
TRANSIENT AIR TRANSPORT OPERATIONS

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
33,389	29,831		3,558	1,558	2,000

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
R/W PRIM	STRN	602	685	116,666	116,666		116,666	SY	1,558
									1,558

HOWARD AIR FORCE BASE

The base to be considered is Howard Air Force Base and is located 4 miles southwest of Balboa in the Canal Zone. The program requested amounts to $1,558,000. The project provides for the strengthening of the 7,000- by 150-foot primary runway, taxiways, and operational apron with a 4-inch asphaltic concrete overlay, required for jet operation and safer service by heavier cargo-type aircraft.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
R/W prim	District engineer	$75.0	60

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have a brief statement on this?

Colonel PARKHILL. I believe we plan to take this by base, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much air traffic do you get at Howard Air Force Base?

Colonel PARKHILL. Do you have any idea of the situation at Howard?

Colonel LILES. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supply that for the record, please.

(The information requested follows:)

The total number of takeoffs and landings at Howard AFB averaged 1,551 per month during the period April 1959 through March 1960.

One takeoff and one landing constitute two actions in the above figure.

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

LAJES FIELD, AZORES

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next area for our consideration is Military Air Transport Service under which we find Lajes Field, Azores.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	LAJES FIELD	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	ANGRA DO HERISMO	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	TERCEIRA IS, AZORES	OTHER ACRES	1,031
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,031
COMMAND	MTO		
PRINCIPAL MISSION		DATE OCC	1947

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 58 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
77,000	53,159	14,887*	8,954	642	8,312

* Incl $2,000 Fam Hsg (S.C.)

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
T/W APRON ACCESS	STAB	594		149	A/R		42,222	42,222	SY	427
T/W R/W ACCESS	STAB	595		149	A/R		10,556	10,556	SY	75
ELEC.DISTRI.LINE.OH		263		NEW	170,426	157,226	13,200	13,200	FT	140
										642

Lajes Field

Lajes is located in the Azores. Six hundred and forty-two thousand dollars is requested to provide three projects needed to satisfy base deficiencies in support of the assigned mission. The first project will provide an additional primary distribution circuit of the loop type, to insure reliability of the primary power supply to critical operational support facilities needed for the fulfillment of the SAC and TAC refueling missions, and to increase the safety of air flight operations through Lajes. The completion of this project will meet the total electrical distribution requirements for the base.

The remaining two projects were authorized but not included in the fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation program. These projects provide apron and runway access taxiway stabilization needed to support the outrigger wheels (20,000-pound single wheel load) on both sides of the SAC medium and heavy bombers. The heavy bombers have more breadth than the existing taxiways and the outrigger wheels overrun the edges of the taxiways causing stones to be blown onto the taxiways in spite of continuous sweeping operations. If foreign objects are sucked into the jet motors heavy and costly damage results.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
T/W apron access stab	District engineer	$21.3	99
T/W R/W access stab	do	3.8	99
Elec. distri. line, OH	do	7.0	60

Mr. Sheppard. There are three items reflected here.

Do you have any problems connected with this that you know of that are not incorporated in the justifications?

Colonel Parkhill. No, sir, no problems.

Mr. Sheppard. The justifications are rather clear. Are there questions on the item?

Mr. Jonas. No questions.

Pacific Air Command

Mr. Sheppard. The next category is the Pacific Air Command. Please insert in the record the summary table reflected on page 795.

(The table follows:)

[In thousands]

Installation	Command	Appropriation request
Clark AB	PAF	8,728
Itazuke AB	PAF	2,792
Kadena AB	PAF	1,063
Kume Shima AS	PAF	28
Kunsan AB	PAF	2,473
Misawa AB	PAF	4,955
Miyako Jima ASN	PAF	18
Naha AB	PAF	1,798
Okinawa M site	PAF	11,000
Osan AB	PAF	1,596
Tainan ASN	PAF	285
Wallace ASN	PAF	1,957
Yokota AB	PAF	3,513
Yuza Dake AS	PAF	26
Total		40,232

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have a summary statement on this, I understand.

Make your presentation, please.

Colonel PARKHILL. Pacific air forces, we have a program involving 14 bases, totaling $40,232,000. The special and high cost projects are, first, Okinawa, MACE facility, for $11 million; Clark Air Force Base, family housing, 400 units, $6 million; Itazuke, family housing, 200 units, $2,300,000; Misawa, family housing, 275 units $3,163,000; Yokota, family housing, 200 units, $2,300,000.

Other projects throughout the Pacific theater are as follows: We have airfield pavements projects for five bases; communications and navigational aids at four bases; approach lights for five bases; taxiway lights at Kunsan and Osan; aircraft shelter, ready, for four bases; various operational facilities for four bases; maintenance facilities, seven bases; supply facilities, four bases; medical facilities at Itazuke and Naha; administrative facilities at four bases; airmen dormitories and dining halls at Tainan and Wallace in the Philippines; officer quarters for Clark and Wallace; dependent schools at Kadena and Naha, Okinawa; recreational facilities at three bases; and utilities for seven bases.

CLARK AIR FORCE BASE, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us take Clark Air Force Base.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY — 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:CLARK AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:3 MI SSE ANGELES	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:PHILIPPINES	OTHER ACRES	:158,257
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:158,257
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	: 1903

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
105,000	73,095	12,893	19,012	8,728	10,284

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
APRON LOADING		84	MTO	149	27,257		27,257	18,000	SY	463
COMM,TRANSMITTER	ADDN	461	USA	NEW	25,616	24,196	1,420	1,420	SF	57
A/C SHELTER READY		64		NEW	68,526	29,041	39,485	12,080	SF	164
TERMINAL AIR FREIGHT	DFRP	464	MTO	149	29,000		29,000	20,000	SF	446
SHLTR,A/C WEAPON CAL		9		NEW	3,745		3,745	1,920	SF	168
STORAGE BASE,SEGMAG		102		149	16,365		16,365	5,455	SF	207
FAMILY HOUSING		108		NEW	2,316	647	1,669	400	EA	6,000
OQ,MEN		111		NEW	490	273	217	40	MN	355
UTILITIES		471		149	N/A	N/A	N/A		LS	76
FLE,PRIMARY POWER		120		NEW	21,500	17,795	3,705	2,500	KW	792
										8,728

Clark Airbase

The first Pacific air forces installation to be considered is Clark Airbase, which is located 3 miles northwest of Angeles, Philippines. The mission of this base is air defense of the islands, tactical fighter squadron support, and Strategic Air Command support. The program requested amounts to $8,728,000 and consists of the following:

The first item is for 18,000 square yards of loading apron. This apron will be used for parking, loading/unloading, servicing and repairing MATS aircraft.

The second item is a 1,420-square-foot addition to the communication transmitter building. These facilities are a part of joint Army, Navy, and Air Force unified service point-to-point offbase communications network. This addition is required to provide space for installation of powerful high-frequency radio communications transmitter.

Two of the next three items provide a 12,080-square-foot ready aircraft shelter and a 1,920-square-foot weapons calibration shelter. These facilities are required for the Century series aircraft. The ready shelter will protect the aircraft weapons and personnel from the tropical weather prevalent at this installation. High humidity at this location has a damaging effect on sensitive electonics systems, rendering them unrealiable or inoperative. The weapons calibration shelter will provide shelter for performing scheduled and unscheduled checking of bore-sighting and forward-firing fire-control systems.

The other item is for a 20,000-square-foot air freight terminal. This base serves as a terminal for three MATS oversea routes. Airfreight for the entire South Pacific area including cargo in support of U.S. embassies, U.S. military advisory groups as well as cargo for the military services is processed through this installation.

The next item provides 5,455 square feet of segregated magazine storage. This storage provides backup for missiles programed for assignment to this installation to support the Century series aircraft.

The next item provides 400 family housing units. The requirement is 2,316 units for officers, airmen, and key civilians. There is a total net deficiency of 1,669 housing units. Adequate offbase housing does not exist to fulfill this requirement.

The next item provides a 40-man officers quarters. Of a requirement for 490 men, only 137 standard and 136 substandard quarters exist. This facility is required to replace part of the substandard quonset and World War II prefab structures.

The next item provides outside utilities to facilities in this program to make them completely usable.

The last item provides a 2,500-kilowatt generator unit. This unit is required to replace the existing nonstandard high-speed units which will be unusable or uneconomically repairable by end of fiscal year 1961.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Apron loading	DIRPACDOCKS	$29.0	100
Comm. transmitter addn	Gonzalo C. Balagtas	2.9	10
A/C shelter ready	DCCD Engineering Corp	8.2	10
Terminal airfreight DFRP	DIRPACDOCKS	22.3	100
Shltr, A/C weapon cal	Engineering & Development Corp	8.4	10
Storage base, Segmag	do	10.3	65
Family housing	Unknown	180.0	15
OQ, men	Gines F. Rivera	18.0	10
Utilities	DIRPACDOCKS	4.0	100
Ele, primary power	Adrian Wilson Associates	39.6	10

What is the nature of the family housing at this location at the present time?

Colonel EDMONDS. The project is for construction of 400 units of family housing; the construction will be concrete hollow block on a concrete slab. The project is divided into 66 units for officers and

334 units for airmen. The construction to the 5-foot line is estimated at $12,740 per unit, with supporting utilities averaging out the total cost at $15,000 a unit for a total of $6 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the family housing at the location at the present time?

Mr. GIBBENS. At the present time we have on base 647 adequate public quarters and 32 adequate private rentals. We also have about 600 additional substandard off base. We have about 28 percent of our requirement on base. In addition, we do have the requirement for the lower grade airmen, which would increase the requirement by about another 980 units.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But you are not constructing for lower grade airmen, are you?

Mr. GIBBENS. No, sir; I mention that to show the extent of our need.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of plans and specifications for this housing project at the present time?

Colonel EDMONDS. The status is about 15 percent complete, Mr. Chairman, as of my last report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the tour of duty at this station with and without dependents, if you know?

Mr. GIBBENS. Eighteen without, sir, and 24 with dependents.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What additional commissary and post exchange facilities will this require?

Mr. GIBBENS. I do not believe that we have completely studied that out, sir. I would say that the added drain on it would be based on use, and we would have to come in based on that requirement. I would think that these houses would generally supplant the inadequate houses that we have on base.

General MINTON. I do not know what they have there now. I know what the requirement will be. If we may get that information and make a statement as to that.

(The following was submitted later:)

Additional commissary and exchange facilities will not be required at Clark Air Force Base at this time as a result of the programing of 400 units of family housing at this installation. The existing commissary and exchange are adequate in size to serve the additional personnel; however, they are to a great extent substandard facilities and will eventually require replacement due to the excessive costs involved in their continued maintenance and repair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you propose to construct this family housing with surplus Commodity Credit funds or not?

(The following was submitted later:)

Public Law 85-685 contained authorization for 900 units of family housing to be constructed under the surplus commodity program. However, a sufficient amount of Philippines pesos was never generated through title I sales under Public Law 480 to finance the project. An attempt was made to use available Japanese yen for this purpose but this proved infeasible.

Mr. GIBBENS. In this case, no, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why not?

Mr. GIBBENS. We were authorized 900 units of surplus commodity housing under Public Law 85-765.

We have not been able to fund this project. We have also made some, or had some activities on the rental guarantee program but the

most feasible proposal that we have had would require about a 10- to 12-year guarantee period which appears to us a little long.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, we are confronted as I understand it now with a difference of understanding over there as to the guaranteed occupancy for a period of 10 to 12 years. If that is the truth, I do not understand why we cannot use their funds and let them take the chance, because the funds are available as I understand it under our agreements with them. If I am in error in that field of thinking, you correct me.

Mr. GIBBENS. No, sir. I believe that I may have couched that a little wrong. Our normal rental guarantee period for family housing is around 5 to 7 years. The only basis that we could work with over there to get a reasonable rental was to have a 10- to 12-year rental guarantee period with the United States furnishing both the land and utilities to the houses. This is so far above our normal that we have not pursued it further than that. We have made every effort to get housing over there through some means. We feel that we have exhausted almost every angle except appropriated funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Irrespective of the time element of the use of a house or houses in a project there are certain funds available for expendable purposes under our agreement with them. What is precluding us from utilizing that and coming up here and asking for a direct appropriation if the money is available?

Mr. GIBBENS. That matter has been carried on through various and sundry channels, trying to make these funds available or to ascertain if funds were available. We have always come up with the answer that they were not available, sir.

General MINTON. Mr. Sheppard, we do not have our housing experts here this morning that know all these answers. There is one other possibility, if you would care to pursue it. General Blake, deputy commander of the Pacific Air Command, is in town today. He will be here to morrow morning. You have got quite a few items of housing for the Pacific Air Command here. If you would care to have him testify before this committee tomorrow morning, he has the detailed information. We can also supply it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would suggest instead of taking his time that you people determine the factors involved here.

General MINTON. We can get those.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Particularly where there are funds available. At the moment we do not understand this. If these funds have accumulated in these areas, we realize the fact that many countries want the American dollar. That is one thing. If we have their funds, we cannot understand why they cannot be applied to housing. There must be some basic reason in there. The agreement we have, as I understand it, does not preclude utilization of the funds. Funds not available could mean many things, meaning by that literally the funds are not there, that is one thing. Next, the funds are there, but we cannot use them, that would keep it in a status of availability. We want to know where the line of demarcation is.

(The following was submitted later:)

Only two title I sales agreements under Public Law 480 have been made with the Philippine Government totaling $14.4 million in dollar equivalent as follows:

1. Agreements signed

	Million-dollar equivalent
June 25, 1957	$10.3
June 3, 1958	4.1
Total	14.4

2. Commodities

	Quantity	Million dollar equivalent
Cotton	32,700 bales	$4.9
Rice	857,000 hundredweight	6.0
Dairy products	16,540,000 pounds	1.7
Fats and oils	3,625,000 pounds	.4
Meats	167,000 pounds	.05
Beans	7,000 hundredweight	.05
Ocean transportation		1.30
Total		14.4

3. Currency uses

		Million dollar equivalent
104(a)	Agricultural market development	$0.80
104(c)	Procurement for common defense	3.10
104(e)	Loans to private enterprise	1.00
104(f)	Payment of U.S. obligations	2.65
104(g)	Loans for economic development	5.20
104(h)	International educational exchange	.80
104(j)	Information and education	.85
Total		14.40

4. Department of Defense uses of Public Law 480 currency

Of the $3.1 million is pesos reserved for 104(c) uses, $2.1 million were approved and programed to finance nine specified projects in accordance with a "supplemental agreement" exchange of letters between JUSMAG and the Philippine Secretary of Defense, dated April 7, 1958. These projects are related to base construction operations. The remaining $1 million of the 104(c) pesos is planned for the support of the Pacific Defense College.

Public Law 480 funds have not been available for military family housing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there questions on the item?

HOUSING AT OKINAWA

Mr. JONAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask some questions about housing at Okinawa.

You made no request for family housing there in this program, is that right?

General MINTON. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. You are asking for family housing in how many places, Colonel? You listed them, but I did not get that.

Mr. SUFFT. Besides the Philippines, three other.

Mr. JONAS. Why is there no request for family housing at Okinawa?

General MINTON. It was not submitted by the Pacific Air Command but the deputy commander who is in town now notified me this morning by message that he wanted to discuss with me the require-

ments for housing in Okinawa—I believe it was 400 units; I have forgotten the exact number. He asked if we would bring it before the committee and see if we could get it in as a late starter. He gave me just about the information that you have there.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to read one paragraph from a letter I received from a constituent at Okinawa. This is from the wife of an airman, a sergeant:

> When I left Charlotte last December, I was looking forward to having my family together again. According to information handed us, we would have a 52-week wait on base housing.
>
> My husband had been here 5 months before I arrived so we would only have 7 months to live offbase. Now they tell us we will have to wait 20 months for this housing. If we had known this beforehand, I would never have brought my children over here to live under present conditions. At the present time we live in a small four-room house with the bare necessities. Our rent is $100 a month. I have a small electric stove which I cannot use because of the outrageous power bill, so I use a two-burner oilstove to cook most of my meals. My power bill is about $30 a month now so you can imagine what it would be if I cooked by electricity or had a television.

She enclosed an article that appeared under the byline of Robert Trumbell, in the New York Times, from which I would like to quote the following:

> The average cottage here, typical of those offered by Okinawan landlords, has four rooms with a total floor space of 685 square feet, about two-thirds of what Air Force housing officers consider the minimum requirement for a small family. One such cottage was occupied by an airman, his wife, and their seven children. A noncommissioned officer may find himself paying more than half his income for rent and utilities in crowded, unwholesome quarters and be faced with numerous practical problems damaging to his efficiency as well as his happiness. Examples are readily discovered in a cluster of cottages on a strip of reclaimed waterfront land near Kadena Air Force Base. The men have to be near the base, so they can reach their stations within an hour of the calling of an alert. This area resembles a dust bowl during Okinawa's long, sweltering summer and a mud hole during the rainy seasons. Frequent typhoons leave these houses flooded with 2 or 3 feet of water for several days at a time, an officer said. The average house has four rooms.

I sent that letter to the Department of the Air Force and received a reply signed by Colonel Sparks, in which he confirmed the fact that as of September 1, 1959, the waiting period for housing was 52 weeks, but now he says it has been extended to 82 weeks because of the transfer of additional personnel from Japan to Okinawa.

Would you say the letter from which I quoted and the article in the New York Times from which I quoted correctly represent the situation in Okinawa?

General MINTON. I have not been there personally, but the information I have received is that it does, both in Okinawa and similar conditions in the Philippines.

Colonel EDMONDS. I have been there, Mr. Jonas, and I would say that for an Okinawan house off base that that is substantially correct.

Mr. JONAS. Don't you think the Air Force is not being fair to these airmen and their wives to tell them that they can have housing in 52 weeks and then have them move their families over there and say, then, "We are sorry, it will be 82 weeks?"

General MINTON. Yes.

Colonel EDMONDS. I am sure that would never be done intentionally, Mr. Jonas.

Mr. JONAS. I do not think anybody——

Colonel EDMONDS. The change would occur between the time he was first notified and the time he arrived.

Mr. JONAS. Colonel Sparks says the reason it was changed was because of the movement and transfer of personnel from Japan to the Island of Okinawa.

How many people have been transferred?

General MINTON. I do not know that. We can find out.

Mr. JONAS. I have never been there myself, and all I know about it is what I have read in this correspondence, but if what I have read is anywhere near accurate or presents anything like a true picture of the situation, I cannot see any greater need for family housing in the other places in the Pacific than exists here. I am just wondering why housing is programed at three other places and nonprogramed on the islands, if there is such an acute need for it.

General MINTON. I do not know the answer to that. I will, tomorrow morning, after my discussion with this officer this afternoon.

Mr. JONAS. I am not presenting this information as a true picture. I am merely presenting it to you for consideration and you will have ways of knowing whether it is an exaggerated picture or whether it correctly represents the situation and if it is the latter, I think some corrective measures should be taken.

We ought not to send families over there with four or seven children to live in four room hovels of the sort described in that article. I think I should say for the record also that Colonel Sparks stated that—

> There is a requirement of 4,238 units of family housing for officers and senior airmen who are entitled to housing under permanent legislation and 1,770 units for other airmen for whom housing cannot be programed. The adequate on-base assets presently available consist of only 1,260 public quarters. This leaves a deficit of over 4,700 units for military personnel who have a need for family housing. These personnel must occupy limited, inadequate military housing, live on the local economy or leave their dependents at home.

He confirms the fact that the average monthly rental for community support quarters varies from $90 to $150 a month plus from $30 to $50 a month for utilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(The following information was submitted later:)

> Mr. JONAS. Why is housing programed at three other locations but not programed on the islands, if there is such an acute need for it?
>
> General MINTON. There is an acute shortage of family housing in Okinawa. Many attempts have been made to relieve this shortage through various programs. In 1957, 200 appropriated fund units were authorized but never funded due to the ever-increasing requirement for higher priority items. In 1959, 200 units of surplus commodity housing were authorized; however, foreign currencies were never generated in that country and an attempt to use Japanese yen was unsuccessful. Previous negotiations for rental guarantee projects had proved unsuccessful because of the excessive guarantee period required. However, during the development of the fiscal year 1961 military construction program, the Pacific Air Command requested rental guarantee authorization for 600 units on Okinawa in hopes of working out an acceptable program. This program has again proved infeasible.
>
> When a similar rental guarantee project for Clark Airbase, Philippines, failed to materialize, it was decided to seek authorization and funding for 400 appropriated fund units at that base. The Air Force plans to follow this same pattern and press for construction of appropriated fund housing on Okinawa at the earliest possible date.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, the committee will come to order.

ITAZUKE AIR FORCE BASE, JAPAN

We will pick up the next item reflected on page 807.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:ITAZUKE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:2 MI WNW FUKOUKA	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:JAPAN	OTHER ACRES	1,456
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,456
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	: 1945

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
15,000	11,286	241	3,473	492	2,981

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY OVERRUN	ADDN	460		NEW	44,444		44,444	19,556	SY	203
LIGHTING, APPROACH		90		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	240
COMP. MED FAC	ADDN	I		NEW	47,394	41,294	6,100	1,508	SF	49
										492

ITAZUKE AIRBASE

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Itazuke Airbase which is located 2 miles southeast of Fukouko in Japan. The planned use of this base is for the air defense of southern Japan, a tactical fighter wing and Strategic Air Command support mission. The requested program amounts to $2,792,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item provides an 880-foot overrun on the north end of the existing 10,000-foot runway. Since land was not available during construction, no overruns were provided for safety of operations. The arresting barriers required for present operations have necessarily been placed 800 feet from each end of the runway, sterilizing it to an effective length of 8,400 feet. Now that land can be made available, the proposed overrun will permit the movement of one barrier in conjunction with construction and increase the effective operational runway to essential requirements.

The next item provides a 3,000-foot U.S. national standard high intensity approach lighting system on the north end of the runway.

The next item is for a 1,508-square-foot addition to the existing medical facility to provide a second operating room for simultaneous surgical requirements.

The last item provides 200 family units. The requirement is 1,313 units for officers, airmen, and key civilians. There is a total net deficiency of 732 housing units. Adequate off-base housing does not exist to fulfill this requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway overrun addn	Unknown	$10	0
Lighting, approach	do	12	0
Comp. med fac addn	do	4	0
Family housing	do	69	0

You have four line items here. What is the nature of the existing family housing at this installation, gentlemen?

Mr. KINTER. Mr. Chairman, I am Mr. Kinter from the Programs Division.

At Itazuke we have a gross requirement for 1,312 units, and offsetting this requirement there are 380 termination-of-war units—these are the Japanese housing—and 200 surplus commodity units, for a total of 580.

This program requests appropriation to construct 200 additional units. When these are constructed, we will then have sufficient on-base housing to provide for 59 percent of our requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the tour of duty here with and without dependents?

Colonel PARKHILL. Thirty-six months with dependents and 24 months without dependents.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What attempts have been made by the Department to secure this housing through surplus commodity funds?

Mr. KINTER. Sir, we have this started in the surplus commodity program, but under this new financing arrangement we are asking for direct appropriations in order to prepurchase the surplus commodity funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why did you switch to direct if you have availability of the other?

General CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, this is in response to instructions from the Bureau of the Budget that beginning this year surplus

commodity funds that are applied to family housing will have to be prepurchased when the project is initiated. This will not only apply to new housing in this program, as we understand it, but also to any housing that was previously authorized as surplus commodity under the surplus commodity program and which had not been initiated by the first of this fiscal year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, am I to interpret your statement that the regulation had been issued by the Bureau of the Budget wherein surplus commodity funds will not be used as they have been in the past; is that correct?

General CURTIN. That is correct. In the past they were reimbursed from quarters allowance withheld. In the future they will be reimbursed immediately as the account is drawn down.

KADENA AIRBASE, OKINAWA

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:KADENA AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI E DOZA	GOVT OWNED	:5,276
COUNTY, STATE	:OKINAWA	OTHER ACRES	: 164
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:5,440
COMMAND	:PACAF	DATE OCC	: 1945

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
125,000	102,227	10,762	12,011	1,063	10,948

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
COMM, RECEIVER		222	USO	NEW	1,870		1,870	1,870	SF	41
SHOP ARM&ELEC	DFRP	101		149	12,550		12,550	12,550	SF	286
ADMIN.SUP&ISSUE,ORG.		232	USO	NEW	30,734	26,702	4,032	4,032	SF	71
SCHOOLT DEP ELEMENTA	ADDN	113		NEW	83,915	54,165	29,750	29,750	SF	665
										1,063

KADENA AIRBASE

The next Pacific Air Force installation is Kadena Airbase, located 1 mile west of Doza on Okinawa. The planned use of this base is for a tactical fighter wing, Strategic Air Command support mission, Strategic Air Command medium bomb squadron, and a radio group mobile. The requested program amounts to $1,063,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item is for support of the U.S. Air Force Security Service Radio Group Mobile being relocated from Japan. The item is a 1,870-square-foot communications receiver building. The communications receiver functions are presently being accomplished in a 960-square-foot temporary quonset hut, so weakened structurally that during typhoon alerts all equipment must be shut down and the building evacuated. This seriously hinders the required continuous 24-hour operation.

The next item is for a 12,550-square-foot armament and electronic shop to perform armament and electronics maintenance for combat-ready aircraft.

The next item is an administration supply and issue building of 4,032 square feet which will replace substandard quonset huts that are being used on an interim basis. Use of these quonsets for storage jeopardizes expensive and highly sensitive electronic equipment subject to damage due to typhoons.

The next item is an addition to the dependents elementary school and provides additional classrooms for 425 students. Facilities for a total of 1,205 students are required. The present school will accommodate only 780 students. The rest are utilizing three airmen dormitories, a music room, a library, a book storage room, supply space and maintenance space which are urgently required for their originally intended use.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Comm receiver	Unknown	$3.0	25
Shop, arm & elec. DFRP	District engineer	14.3	50
Admin. sup & issue, org	Unknown	3.7	25
School, T/dep/elementa addn	do	33.2	40

Mr. SHEPPARD. Kadena is reflected on page 811.

What are you using for dependent schools now and what will you do with these facilities if new ones are funded and constructed?

Colonel PARKHILL. We are proposing to replace three airmen dormitories that are required as dormitories to support an increased mission here. We have an existing school that will take care of 630 students. Using the dorms, we have space for 267 students. This request in this program will provide for 425 students. We will still be somewhat short and we will still have to use part of these dormitories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will be the extent of the shortages after you have constructed the quarters, if they are funded? What will be the balance of the requirement?

Colonel PARKHILL. We will be 19 students short.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the three items that I have covered, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

MISAWA AIRBASE, JAPAN

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :MISAWA
DIR TO TOWN :10 SW TOWADA
COUNTY, STATE :JAPAN
COUNTRY
COMMAND :PACAF

PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES :3,934
TOTAL ACRES :3,934

DATE OCC : 1945

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
17,000	11,448	723	4,829	1,792	3,037

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TAXIWAY,RUNWAY ACCES	REHB	83		NEW	238,942	238,942		58,314	SY	643
LIGHTING,APPROACH		92		NEW	6,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	FT	226
LIGHTING, APPROACH		88		NEW	6,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	FT	218
OPERATIONS,AFSS	ADDN	225	USO	NEW	54,265	36,265	18,000	18,000	SF	300
HQ GROUP,AFSS		233	USO	NEW	10,775		10,775	7,360	SF	105
ELEC DIST SYSTEM		121		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	KW	300
										1,792

MISAWA AIRBASE

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Misawa Airbase, which is located 10 miles northeast of Towada in northern Japan. The mission of this base is a two-squadron tactical fighter wing, a jet tactical reconnaissance photo squadron, a radio group mobile, and a radio squadron mobile. The program requested amounts to $4,955,000 and consists of the following:

The first item provides for the rehabilitation of 58,314 square yards of taxiway access on the north side of the runway. The present taxiways are spalling and deteriorating to the extent that normal maintenance cannot correct the deficiencies.

The next two items provide a standard 3,000-foot approach lighting system at both ends of the runway. The cold water currents and easterly winds encountered during spring at this installation cause low cloud stratum and fog to form within a period of 15 minutes. During winter months, fast-moving cold-air fronts formed in this area often result in sudden occurrence of snowstorms and high winds of such intensity that transition from a clear weather condition to instrument flight rules condition occurs within a period of few minutes.

The next two items are to support the increased Security Service mission of the radio group mobile by providing an addition of 18,000 square feet to existing 36,265-square-foot operations building, and construction of a 7,360-square-foot headquarters group building needed to support additional functions due to relocation of units from Honshu Island.

The additional space in the operations building is a new requirement created by the transfer and enlargement of the second echelon processing element from Honshu Island. During the interim period, operational and other facilities are being used, thereby overcrowding these vital facilities, which makes for a highly undesirable operational condition. Further, there are no existing buildings that can be modified to provide this type of requirement.

The group headquarters building is required to provide space for the group commander and his staff of 65 people to properly administer the assigned personnel. No alternate facility is available at the radio group mobile site, which is 5 miles from the base proper. Due to acute shortage of space, a dining hall is being utilized. To permit the dining hall to revert to its vitally needed intended use, an interim facility is being accomplished to provide minimum administration space and it will be used as a training facility when this requested item is completed.

The next item provides a 1,500-kilovolt-ampere electric distribution facility for the conversion of the 50-cycle commercial power to base-required 60-cycle power. Satisfactory power cannot be obtained and maintained through the employment of small, portable diesel-engine-driven generator sets.

The last item provides 275 family housing units. The requirement is 1,470 units for officers, airmen, and key civilians. There is a net deficiency of 803 housing units. Adequate off-base housing does not exist to fulfill this requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Taxiway, runway access rehb	Unknown	$32.0	0
Lighting, approach	do	10.9	0
Do	do	10.9	0
Operations, AFSS, addn	do	15.0	0
HQ group, AFSS	do	6.0	0
Elec dist system	do	14.0	0
Family housing	do	90.0	0

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up the next item having to do with Misawa, Japan, on page 832.

I wish you would answer the usual questions that we have asked with reference to family housing. What is the general status of that situation, please?

Mr. KINTNER. Mr. Chairman, this item requests appropriation of $3.16 million to construct 275 units of family housing at Misawa Airbase in Japan.

Our gross requirement there is for 1,470 units. Offsetting this requirement there are 459 termination-of-war Japanese units and 208 surplus commodity units for a total of 667. Construction of these proposed 275 units, together with those existing on the base, would provide onbase housing for 64 percent of our gross requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume the same answer applies so far as commodity funds, in this instance as prevailed in the previous one?

Mr. KINTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The appropriate data for the other projects under this command will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The data follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:KUME SHIMA AIR STA	GOVT LEASED	: 63
DIR TO TOWN	:50 MI ESE NAHA	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:RYUKYU ISLANDS	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 63
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	:1952

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
2,227	1,720	15	492	28	464

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
WATER SUPPLY STORAGE	620		149	70,000	10,000	60,000	60,000	GA	28

28

Kume Shima Air Station

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Kume Shima Air Station which is located 50 miles northwest of Naha. The mission of the base is aircraft control and warning. The requested program amounts to $28,000.

The item requested is a 60,000 gallon steel tank for additional water storage. The present supply is only 10,000 gallons storage and is grossly deficient.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Water supply storage	District engineer	$1.5	65

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :KUNSAN AIR BASE
DIR TO TOWN :8 MI NE KUNSAN
COUNTY, STATE :KOREA
COUNTRY
COMMAND :PACAF
PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES :2,307
TOTAL ACRES :2,307
DATE OCC : 1946

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
14,000	6,238	2,256	5,506	2,473	3,033

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
APRON,OPER,ALERT		85		NEW	41,700		41,700	41,700	SY	500
TACAN STATION,FIXED		86		NEW	1		1	1	EA	64
LIGHTING,APPROACH		91		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	326
LIGHTING,TAXIWAY		462		NEW	19,940		19,940	19,940	FT	100
A/C SHELTER,READY		95		NEW	13	5	8	8	EA	350
HANGAR,MAINT.ORG.		99		NEW	6,400		6,400	6,400	SF	86
SHOP A/C MAINT SP/PU		100		149	14,976		14,976	5,395	SF	107
STOR,IGLOO		103		NEW	4		4	3	EA	180
COLD STORAGE FOOD BA	DFRP	468		149	1,992		1,992	1,992	SF	53
WHSE,SUP.&EQUIP,BSE	RPMT	469		NEW	30,841	9,936	20,905	20,905	SF	200
CLUB,SERVICE	DFRP	117		NEW	10,500		10,500	7,000	SF	130
ELE,EMERG,POWR PLANT		119		NEW	1,525	825	700	700	KW	230
FENCE,SECURITY		122		NEW	29,600	9,100	20,500	20,500	FT	147
										2,473

KUNSAN AIR BASE

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Kunsan Air Base which is located 8 miles southwest of Kunsan, Korea. The mission of the base is a tactical bomb squadron, tactical jet photo reconnaissance squadron, and a tactical fighter squadron. The program requested amounts to $2,473,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item provides an operational apron to support century series aircraft assigned to this base.

The next item provides a fixed TACAN station as part of the Korea-Japan-Okinawa TACAN network.

The next two items provide 3,000 feet of approach lighting and 19,940 feet of taxiway lighting. The approach lighting will provide a high intensity lighting system used in conjunction with ground control approach system. The taxiway lighting is provided on the primary taxiways and connecting parking apron. At present, there are no lighting facilties at this base.

The next item provides eight ready aircraft shelters to provide minimum protection for assigned aircraft and equipment from humidity, heat, and foreign materials.

The next item provides a maintenance hangar to provide adequate organizational maintenance on assigned aircraft. At present, no facility exists for the requirement. Severe winter conditions in Korea makes an enclosed working area a necessity.

The next item provides a 5,395-square-foot aircraft maintenance shop. This shop is required to provide necessary facilities to perform maintenance on alert aircraft at this location.

The next item provides three igloos for the storage of ammunition, bombs, and rockets. Ammunition is now being stored in the open, in tents, and temporary quonsets. These temporary facilities do not provide the security and protection required.

The next item provides a 1,992-square-foot cold storage building. The present portable refrigerator boxes are old and the machinery obsolete. Due to the remote location of this installation, it is important that good refrigerator facilities be available to prevent spoilage.

The next item provides 20,905 square feet of base supply warehouse to replace the temporary tropical shell-type structures. The tropical shells, erected during the Korean conflict, are beyond economical repair.

The next item provides a 7,000-square-foot service club to replace the temporary type structure constructed on a wartime basis with a life expectancy of 2 years.

The next item provides a 700-kilowatt electrical emergency powerplant to furnish emergency backup power for the critical operational and communication facilities. The Korean produced power is unreliable and has a history of frequent power outages.

The last item provides 20,500 feet of security fencing to properly safeguard classified areas. The present fencing is grossly ineffective and allows large-scale penetration and pilferage of Government property. More serious is the jeopardy of our mission and the threat of sabotage.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Apron, operational alert	Unknown	$20.0	0
TACAN station, fixed	do	3.2	0
Lighting, approach	do	16.3	0
Lighting, taxiway	do	5.0	0
Aircraft shelter, ready	do	12.0	0
Hangar, maintenance, organizational	do	4.3	0
Shop aircraft maintenance SP/PU	Pacific Avch. & Eng	5.4	75
Storage, igloo	Unknown	9.0	0
Cold storage food, BA DFRP	Pacific Avch. & Eng	2.6	75
Warehouse, supply, and equipment, base RPMT.	Unknown	10.0	0
Club, service	do	6.5	0
Electrical emergency powerplant	do	11.5	0
Fence, security	do	7.3	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:MIYAKO JIMA AIR STA	GOVT LEASED :	49
DIR TO TOWN	:160 MI NE NAHA	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:RYUKYU ISLANDS	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	49
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	:1950

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
2,039	1,530	150	359	18	341

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SUPPLY AND ISSUE SAO	299		NEW	1,000		1,000	1,000	SF	18
									18

Miyako Jima Air Station

Miyako Jima Air Station is located 160 miles southwest of Naha. The mission of the base is aircraft control and warning. The program requested amounts to $18,000.

The item requested is a 1,000-square-foot supply and issue building. Due to the remoteness of this site and difficulty in transportation, it is necessary to maintain a 30-day stock level of technical supplies and equipment. No facilities exist that could be used for this function.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Supply and issue, SAC	Unknown	$1	25

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:NAHA AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	:1,390
DIR TO TOWN	:2 MI E NAHA	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:OKINAWA	OTHER ACRES	: 420
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:1,810
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	: 1945

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
56,000	43,442	922	11,636	1,798	9,838

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
MAINT.DOCK,MED.A/C		219		NEW	7		7	3	EA	400
SHOP ARM&ELEC	DFRP	467		149	3,400		3,400	3,378	SF	79
DENTAL CLINIC	RPMT	107		NEW	8,544		8,544	8,544	SF	263
SCHOOL,DEP.ELEMENTAR	ADDN	114		NEW	45,584	12,414	33,170	33,170	SF	749
CLUB,SERVICE		470		NEW	19,800		19,800	11,800	SF	307
										1,798

NAHA AIR BASE

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Naha Air Base which is located 2 miles west of Naha, Okinawa. The mission of this base is a fighter interceptor squadron and two troop carrier squadrons. The program requested amounts to $1,798,000 and consists of the following:

The first item provides three aircraft maintenance docks to support the second troop carrier squadron being assigned to this base.

The next item provides for a 3,378-square-foot arm and electronics shop. This facility is required to house the MB–10 mockup. If a "black box" does not check out during line maintenance (and there are 104 per aircraft) it must be pulled from the aircraft and placed in the mockup for determining and correcting malfunctions.

The next item provides an 8,544-square-foot dental clinic with 12 operating units. This project will replace a 2,432-square-foot quonset-type building that has deteriorated to an unusable condition.

The next item provides 33,170 square feet addition to the present school. The deficiency is presently being met by utilizing 28 temporary substandard quonsets, erected in 1947 and beyond economical repair.

The last item provides an 11,800-square-foot service club. The present service club is housed in four temporary quonsets beyond economical repair.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Maint. dock, med A/C	Unknown	$15.0	62
Shop arm and elec DFRP	District engineer	3.9	75
Dental clinic	Unknown	13.0	25
School, dep. elementar addn	do	25.0	25
Club, service	do	15.2	25

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :OKINAWA "M" SITE
DIR TO TOWN :NAGO
COUNTY, STATE :OKINAWA
COUNTRY
COMMAND :PACAF

PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES
TOTAL ACRES

DATE OCC

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
25,000		12,500	12,500	11,000	1,500

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
OPERATIONAL FAC	I		NEW	N/A	N/A	N/A		LS	11,000
									11,000

Okinawa "M" Site

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is the Okinawa "M" site. The committee has been furnished details concerning intended use of this base and the programed items. This program request amounts to $11 million.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Operational fac	Thom. B. Bourne Assoc	$450.0	35

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:OSAN AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:13 MI NE SUWON	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:KOREA	OTHER ACRES	:1,480
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:1,480
COMMAND	:PACAF	DATE OCC	1951

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
19,989	11,313	2,229	6,447	1,596	4,851

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TACAN STATION,FIXED		87		NEW	1		1	1	EA	50
LIGHTING,APPROACH		93		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	311
LIGHTING,TAXIWAY		463		NEW	14,000		14,000	14,000	FT	105
A/C SHELTER,READY		96		NEW	14	4	10	5	EA	400
SHOP,REFUELING VEH		465		NEW	2,914		2,914	2,914	SF	61
STOR,IGLOO		104		NEW	5		5	4	EA	241
HEADQUARTERS,SQ.	RPMT	574	USO	NEW	20,600	16,920	3,680	3,680	SF	59
ELEC.PRIMARY POWER	ADDN	472		NEW	3,250	2,500	750	750	KW	260
FENCE,SECURITY		123		NEW	33,590	15,780	17,810	17,810	FT	109
										1,596

OSAN AIRBASE

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Osan Airbase which is located 13 miles southwest of Suwon, Korea. The mission of this base is a tactical bomber squadron, tactical photo reconnaissance squadron, fighter interceptor squadron, tactical fighter squadron, and a radio squadron mobile. The program requested amounts to $1,596,000 and consists of the following:

The first item provides a fixed TACAN station and is required for the Korea-Japan-Okinawa TACAN network and provides primary short-range navigational aid for aircraft.

The next two items provide a 3,000-foot standard approach lighting system and 14,000 feet of taxiway lighting. The approach lights will be on the west end of runway and is an urgent requirement in support of the night operations. Approach lights do not exist at this base. The taxiway lights are for the parallel taxiway and connecting taxiways to the dispersal areas. At present, there are no taxiway lights at this base.

The next item provides five ready aircraft shelters for 10 Century series aircraft. These shelters will provide minimum protection from the weather extremes of the area.

The next item provides a 2,914-square-foot vehicle refueling shop for the maintenance of 25 refueling vehicles and 76 refueling hose carts. The function is now being performed in the open.

The next item provides four igloos for the storage of ammunition, bombs, and missiles. These are now being stored in the open, in tents and temporary quonsets which do not provide proper security or protection.

The next item provides a 3,680-square-foot squadron headquarters and will replace three unusable structures totaling 2,400 square feet. This item supports the U.S. Air Force Security Service Radio Mobile Group mission at this base.

The next item provides for the expansion of the existing powerplant by the addition of one 750-kilowatt diesel generator. The requirement for power at this base is for 3,250 kilowatts with 2,500 kilowatts existing. Present load average is 2,550 to 2,650 kilowatts, requiring continuous running of all generators. No dependable or reliable commercial power exists.

The last item provides 17,810 feet of security fencing required for minimum security of vital areas. The present perimeter fence is inadequate, permitting large-scale penetration, pilferage, and threat of sabotage.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
TACAN station, fixed	Unknown	$2.5	0
Lighting, approach	do	10.0	0
Lighting, taxiway	do	5.0	0
A/C shelter, ready	do	20.0	0
Shop, refueling veh	do	4.0	0
Stor, igloo	do	12.0	0
Headquarters, SQ RPMT USO	do	3.0	0
Elec primary power addn	do	12.0	0
Fence, security	do	5.2	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:TAINAN AIR STA	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:TAIWAN	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:TAIWAN (FORMOSA)	OTHER ACRES	: 110
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 110
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	:1955

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
1,135		682	453	285	168

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
A/C SHELTER, READY	97		NEW	2		2	2	EA	227
DORMITORY A/M	110		NEW	534	100	434	72	MN	58
									285

Tainan Air Station

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Tainan Air Station and is located on Taiwan (Formosa). The mission of this base is in support of assigned tactical fighter aircraft. The program requested amounts to $285,000 and consists of the following:

The first item provides two ready aircraft shelters. This item is in support of the F–100 aircraft programed at this installation. Due to the complexity of these aircraft and critical weapons, these facilities are required to protect both aircraft and personnel from direct exposure of the elements while standing alert missions.

The last item provides a 72-airman dormitory. There is a requirement for 534 spaces and 100 standard spaces exist. Three hundred and twenty-four airmen are presently being housed in 4 warehouse type structures being used as dormitories under emergency conditions. The remaining 110 airmen are forced to live in substandard private rentals which do not meet sanitary and health requirements. Mission personnel living in private rentals must be picked up individually during an alert. No adequate communications system exists and the Chinese will not permit sirens.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
A/C shelter, ready	American Eng & Arch	$11.5	0
Dormitory A/M	do	3.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :WALLACE AIR STA
DIR TO TOWN :2 MI NNE SAN FERNANDO
COUNTY, STATE :PHILIPPINES
COUNTRY
COMMAND :PACAF

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES : 541
TOTAL ACRES : 541
DATE OCC : 1903

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
2,067	110		1,957	1,957	

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
OPERATIONS,AC&W	DFRP	298		NEW	6,828	1,295	5,533	6,828	SF	288
HEADQUARTERS,SQ	DFRP	300		NEW	2,800	1,681	1,119	2,800	SF	75
DORMITORY,AIRMEN		301		NEW	216	26	190	216	MN	546
DINING HALL,AIRMEN	RPMT	302		NEW	4,057		4,057	4,057	SF	209
OQ,MEN		303		NEW	32		32	32	MN	242
RECTN,MULTI-PURP,		304		NEW	3,360		3,360	3,360	SF	82
UTILITIES		305		NEW	N/A	N/A	N/A		LS	182
ELE,PRIMARY POWER	RPMT	306		NEW	700		700	700	KW	333
										1,957

Wallace Air Station

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Wallace Air Station which is located 2 miles southwest of San Fernando in the Philippines. The mission of this base is for an aircraft control and warning station. The program requested amounts to $1,957,000 and consists of the following:

Operations aircraft control and warning building, 6,828 square feet; squadron headquarters, 2,800 square feet; airmen dormitories, 216 men; airmen dining hall, 4,057 square feet; officers quarters, 32 men; multipurpose recreation building, 3,360 square feet; utilities and electric primary power, 700 kilowatts.

The above facilities are required for the overall modernization of the Wallace Aircraft Control and Warning Station to provide ground control intercept capability for defense of the Philippine Islands to permit complete combat effectiveness of the century series aircraft being deployed to this area. Wallace Air Station is presently operating under a limited detection and warning capability, dependent upon obsolete equipment. There are no usable standard facilities existing at this station.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Operations, AC & W DFRP	Adrian Wilson & Associates	$14.0	10
Headquarters, SQ DFRP	Gonzalo C. Balagtes	3.7	10
Dormitory, airmen	Adrian Wilson & Associates	27.0	10
Dining hall, airmen RPMT	do	10.0	10
OQ, men	Gines F. Rivera, architect	12.0	10
Rectn, multipurp	OICC, Philippines	4.0	10
Utilities	Adrian Wilson & Associates	9.0	10
Ele primary power RPMT	do	10.0	80

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:YOKOTA AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI NNW FUSSA MACHI	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:JAPAN	OTHER ACRES	: 1,706
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 1,706
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	: 1945

PRINCIPAL MISSION]

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
21,300	10,715	1,638	8,947	3,513	5,434

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RUNWAY, OVERRUNS	ADDN	82		NEW	44,444	33,333	11,111	11,111	SY	113
LIGHTING APPROACH		89		NEW	3,000	1,000	2,000	3,000	FT	218
LIGHTING APPROACH		94		NEW	3,000	1,000	2,000	3,000	FT	218
HANGAR ALERT	MOD	98		NEW	21,452	6,947	14,505		LS	285
SHOP,ARM & ELEC.BSE	MOD	466		NEW	40,300	50,000		27,650	SF	175
COLD STORAGE FOOD BA	DFRP	105		149	8,650		8,650	8,650	SF	204
FAMILY HOUSING		536		NEW	2,503	684	1,819	200	FA	2,300
										3,513

YOKOTA AIR BASE

The next Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Yokota Air Base and is located 1 mile southeast of Fussa Machi in Japan. The mission of this base is a tactical bomb wing, composite reconnaissance squadron, tactical air refueling squadron, weather reconnaissance squadron, fighter interceptor squadron, Strategic Air Command medium reconnaissance squadron, and Strategic Air Command support squadron. The program requested amounts to $3,513,000 and consists of the following:

The first item is for a 500-foot overrun at the north end of the runway. This portion of the overrun, although necessary, could not be constructed due to lack of land. The Japanese Government has recently made the land available. This addition will provide a standard overrun to protect the pilot and aircraft during emergency takeoffs and landings.

The next two items provide a standard 3,000-foot approach lighting system at both ends of the runway. These systems are required to facilitate aircraft landings under restricted visibility conditions prevalent in this area. Landings are about equally divided between both approaches to the runway.

The next item provides an alert hangar to support the new century series aircraft assigned to this base. This project provides for modification and addition to existing building to accommodate four aircraft. This facility will provide protection from the tropical weather for the century series aircraft and their weapons.

The next item provides for the modification of an existing hangar to furnish 27,650 square feet of armament and electronic shop space. This base is programed to provide armament and electronic support for 18 different types of aircraft totaling above 150 aircraft.

The next item is for an 8,650-square-foot cold-storage building to replace the present temporary walk-in field-type boxes beyond economical repair.

The last item provides 200 family housing units. The requirement is 2,503 units for officers, airmen, and key civilians. There is a total net deficiency of 1,819 units. Adequate off-base housing does not exist to fulfill this requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway, overruns, addn	Unknown	$5.0	0
Lighting approach	do	11.0	0
Do	do	11.0	0
Hangar alert, mod	do	14.0	0
Shop, arm and elect, BSE MOD	do	11.5	0
Cold storage food BA DFRP	Trans.-Asia eng. assoc	10.0	100
Family housing	Unknown	69.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:YUZA DAKE AIR STA	GOVT LEASED :	61
DIR TO TOWN	:6 MI NW NAHA	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:RYUKYU ISLAND	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES :	61
COMMAND	:PACAF		
		DATE OCC	:1953

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
1,669	1,385	133	151	26	125

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMP	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
WATER SUPPLY STORAGE	621		149	70,000	10,000	60,000	60,000	GA	26
									26

YUZA DAKE AIR STATION

The last Pacific Air Force installation to be considered is Yuza Dake Air Station which is located 6 miles southeast of Naha on Okinawa. The mission of this base is for an aircraft control and warning station. The program requested amounts to $26,000.

The project requested is for an addition to the present water system. The requirement is for 70,000 gallons per day and only 10,000 gallons are available. During the dry season, the existing water supply is so depleted that it is necessary to truck water. This makes it difficult to support the 249 personnel, insure continued operation of 7 diesel powerplants, and provide adequate fire protection. The requested facility will meet 100 percent of the requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Water supply storage	District engineer	$1.3	0

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item having to do with the Strategic Air Command.

Please insert the summary table on page 880 of the justification.

(The table follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Andersen, AFB	SAO	$70
Ernest Harmon	SAO	1,724
Goose	SAO	1,595
Ramey	SAO	70
Total		3,439

ERNEST HARMON AIR FORCE BASE, NEWFOUNDLAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the Ernest Harmon Air Force Base, Newfoundland.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:ERNEST HARMON AFB	GOVT LEASED	:7,920
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI STEPHENVILLE	GOVT OWNED	:
COUNTY, STATE	:NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:7,920
COMMAND	:SAO		
		DATE OCC	: 1942

PRINCIPAL MISSION :

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
143,630	116,834	16,477	10,319	1,724	8,595

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.,	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
RAPCON CENTER	ADDN	I		NEW	6,034	1,268	4,766	3,214	SF	88
OPERATIONS,BASE	DFRP	43		NEW	8,715		8,715	8,715	SF	262
SCHOOL DEPENDENT HI	DFRP	I		NEW	40,700		40,700	36,500	SF	1,185
CHAPEL ANNEX		409		NEW	8,700		8,700	4,058	SF	189
										1,724

ERNEST HARMON AIR FORCE BASE

The next installation is Ernest Harmon Air Force Base located on the west coast of Newfoundland, Canada. The planned use of this base is for Strategic Air Command air refueling tankers and fighter interceptors for the Air Defense Command. The program requested amounts to $1,724,000 and includes the following items:

The first item will provide an addition to the rapcon center at an estimated cost of $88,000. The addition will house new electronic equipment required for this function.

The second item will replace the existing base operations building with a new structure. At present, this function is handled in a tar-paper-covered theater-of-operations warehouse-type building that has deteriorated beyond economical repair. It is inadequate in size to handle the processing of over 1,500 aircraft clearances per month. The present building will be demolished as soon as the new facility is available.

The third item will provide for construction of a junior-senior high school. At the present time, 283 students are using temporarily converted airmen dormitories for classrooms. As families move into housing now under construction, the student load will increase and further aggravate the crowded conditions.

The last item will provide for a chapel annex. This facility will provide space for those activities which are a necessary part of religious education and cultural programs. At the present time, a limited program is carried on in the basement storage area of a bachelor officers' quarters.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Rapcon center, addition	District engineer	$4.5	3
Operations, Base DFRP	do	13.0	6
School Dependent HI DFRP	Greenburg & Ames	49.0	3
Chapel annex	do	9.0	60

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask you, What you are using for high school facilities at this base at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. We are using dormitory space at the present time. We have no regular high school space at all. These dormitories are also needed as dormitories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you providing any educational facilities at all for the non-U.S. military personnel?

Colonel PARKHILL. Just for the dependents of the U.S. military and civilian personnel.

GOOSE AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item has to do with Goose Air Force Base, page 888.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:GOOSE AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	:6,854
DIR TO TOWN	:216 MI SE ST ANTHONY	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:LABRADOR, CANADA	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:6,854
COMMAND	:SAO		
		DATE OCC	: 1942

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
145,837	125,188	17,431	3,218	1,595	1,623

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
OQ MEN	404		NEW	637	175	462	48	MN	625
SCHOOL DEP ELEMENTAR ADDN	I		NEW	42,980	15,720	27,260	20,200	SF	776
CHAPEL ANNEX	410		NEW	8,700		8,700	4,058	SF	194
									1,595

Goose Air Base

The next installation to be considered is Goose Air Base. It is located in the south central part of Labrador, Canada, at the confluence of the Goose and Hamilton Rivers. The planned mission of this base includes Strategic Air Command air-refueling tankers, medium bomber mission, and fighter interceptors for the Air Defense Command. The program requested amounts to $1,595,000 and will provide for the following items:

The first item, costing $625,000, will provide 48 additional bachelor officers' quarters for the officers assigned to this remote base. At the present time, there are only 175 standard quarters to accommodate a requirement of 463 men.

The next item will provide an addition to the existing elementary school at an estimated cost of $776,000. Goose Air Base is completely isolated. There are no available schools for over 300 miles. The existing school was built to accommodate 225 pupils. The enrollment is over 500 pupils, with more to come when the 100 additional family houses, now under construction, are completed.

The last item will provide a chapel annex at an estimated cost of $194,000. This facility is required to conduct religious educational activities for both the children and adults.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Officers' quarters, men	District engineer	$31	9
School, dependents, elementary, addition.	Urbahan Brayton & Burrows	35	24
Chapel annex	District engineer	7	12

Mr. Sheppard. What are you using for elementary school space here at the present time?

Colonel Parkhill. Mr. Chairman, we have a small school that will take care of 225 students. The present student load is 502 students. These are crowded into the available school building. As a result we are requesting an addition which will provide for 291 more students.

Mr. Sheppard. Are you providing any educational facilities here for non-U.S. military personnel?

Colonel Parkhill. Providing for the dependents of U.S. military personnel and any other American civilians that would be employed at this base.

Mr. Sheppard. Are there contracts involved in these categories I have just covered here this morning to be issued on the same premise that those testified to heretofore were?

General Minton. These are advertised on completed plans and specifications.

Mr. Sheppard. Questions upon these items, gentlemen?

Mr. Sikes. No questions.

Mr. Jonas. No questions.

Mr. Sheppard. All right, we shall insert at this point the project data for the other bases not considered in detail.

(The data follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:ANDERSEN AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:13 MI SE AGANA	GOVT OWNED	:11,085
COUNTY, STATE	:GUAM	OTHER ACRES	: 45
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:11,130
COMMAND	:SAO		
		DATE OCC	: 1945

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
419	70	3,611	180	4,280	965	140

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
80,000	60,613	17,609	1,778	50	1,728

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
ELEC DISTRIB LINE UG	ADDN	415	NEW					LS	50
									50

ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE

The first Strategic Air Command installation overseas to be considered is Andersen Air Force Base located on the island of Guam in the Marianna Islands. The planned use of this base is for Strategic Air Command missions together with Military Air Transport Air rescue and weather reconnaissance units and Pacific Air Force fighter interceptor aircraft. The program amounts to $50,000 and will provide an addition to the base electrical distribution system. This project will provide the necessary switches to permit isolation of an area undergoing repair without having to shut off the entire base power.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Elec distrib line UG addn	Unknown	$2.5	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:RAMEY AFB	GOVT LEASED	: 70
DIR TO TOWN	::5 MI SW AGUADILLA	GOVT OWNED	:2,706
COUNTY, STATE	:PUERTO RICO	OTHER ACRES	: 5
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 2,781
COMMAND	:SAO		
		DATE OCC	: 1939

PRINCIPAL MISSION:

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
160,419	142,102	15,881	2,436	70	2,366

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
INSTR LANDING SYSTEM	334		NEW	1		1	1	EA	70
									70

Ramey Air Force Base

Ramey Air Force Base is the next Strategic Air Command overseas installation to be considered. It is located in Puerto Rico. The planned use of this base is for Strategic Air Command heavy bombers and air-refueling aircraft. The program request amounts to $70,000 and will provide an instrument landing system. This system provides for instrument landings during periods of low ceiling and visibility. This project is of prime importance to safety of personnel and aircraft.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Instr landing system	District engineer	$3.5	10

Air Force Europe

Mr. Sheppard. The next item concerns Air Force in Europe. Insert in the record the summary table on page 894 and the project data for all the bases listed thereon.

(The pages follow:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Athenai AP	AFE	197
Aviano AB	AFE	134
Bentwaters RA	AFE	271
Bitburg AB	AFE	463
Chaumont AB	AFE	96
Gigli AB	AFE	5,682
Hahn AB	AFE	248
Incirlik AB	AFE	621
Ramstein AB	AFE	90
Sembach AB	AFE	262
Spangdahlem AB	AFE	202
Wiesbaden AB	AFE	691
Various locations	AFE	13,380
Total		22,337

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :ATHENAI APT
DIR TO TOWN :ATHENS
COUNTY, STATE :GREECE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :USAFE

PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES : 45
TOTAL ACRES : 45

DATE OCC :1953

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
3,500	2,147	380	973	197	776

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
DORMITORY, AIRMEN	458		NEW	432	133	299	133	MN	197
									197

54509—60—13:2——25

ATHENAI AIRPORT

The first installation is Athenai Airport. It is located near Athens, Greece. The planned use of this base is as an air division headquarters and for area support including the U.S. Embassy. The program requested at Athenai totals $197,000 and provides for construction of a 133-man dormitory. Of the 432-space requirement, 133 spaces are under construction. This request will leave a deficiency of 166 spaces. These facilities are required to provide housing on base, for lower grade airmen. At present, these men are living off base.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Dormitory, airmen	Unknown	$9.8	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:AVIANO AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:PORDONONE	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:ITALY	OTHER ACRES	: 815
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 815
COMMAND	:USAFE		
		DATE OCC	:1955

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/RQT	BASE	TRANS/RQT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
1,000	266		734	134	600

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
CHAPEL, BASE	80		NEW	9,148		9,148	8,960	SF	134
									134

Aviano Air Base

Aviano Air Base is located near Pordenone, Italy, and the flying mission is tactical fighter aircraft. The program requested for Aviano consists of a 200-seat chapel with connecting annex at a total cost of $134,000. No chapel building exists. The makeshift chapel being used is not suitable for religious services. Religious services and education classes are conducted in various rooms under cramped conditions.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Chapel, base	Unknown	$7.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:BENTWATERS RAF STA	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:EYKE	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:ENGLAND	OTHER ACRES	801
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	801
COMMAND	:USAFE		
		DATE OCC	1951
PRINCIPAL MISSION			

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
13,000	7,538	4,137	1,325	271	1,054

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP ARM & ELECT.	542		NEW	12,550		12,550	12,550	SF	271
									271

Bentwaters RAF Station

The next intallation is Bentwaters RAF Station, located 5 miles northeast of Woodbridge, England. The principal flying mission consists of tactical fighter aircraft. The request in this program totals $271,000 and provides for the construction of a 12,550-square-foot armament and electronic shop. At the present time, this maintenance function is being performed in five widely separated buildings, two of which are temporary and three semipermanent. These buildings are of such nature that they cannot be economically air conditioned or made dust free. The requested project will satisfy the full requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop arm & elect	British Air Ministry	$12.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:BITBURG AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED :	
DIR TO TOWN	:2 MI NNW BITBURG	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:GERMANY	OTHER ACRES	:1,068
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:1,068
COMMAND	:USAFE		
		DATE OCC	: 1952
PRINCIPAL MISSION			

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
15,000	35	7,064	7,901	463	7,438

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
HARD STND, DISPER PA	WDN	62		NEW	50,820	36,020	14,800	14,800	SY	193
SCHOOL DEP. HI	ADDN	75		NEW	35,970	8,000	27,970	18,000	SF	270
										463

Bitburg Air Base

Bitburg Air Base is the next installation, located near Bitburg, Germany. The principal flying mission aircraft are tactical fighter and fighter interceptors. The program requested for Bitburg amounts to $463,000 which includes the following two items:

The first item is for widening 47 existing hardstands for dispersal parking. Existing hardstands are too small to permit new type aircraft to turn around.

The second item is for an addition to the dependent high school. This school also includes student requirements from three nearby U.S. Air Force installations. The present school facilities are too small to take care of all personnel, thus necessitating the use of makeshift space to provide substandard facilities. The total space requirement is for 327 pupils. The existing facilities, plus the requested addition, would provide suitable space to accommodate only 236 pupils.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Hard stnd, disper PA wen	Unknown	$11.6	0
School dep HI addn	do	14.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :CHAUMONT
DIR TO TOWN :4 MI SW CHAUMONT
COUNTY, STATE :FRANCE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :USAFE

PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES :1,252
TOTAL ACRES :1,252

DATE OCC : 1952

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
23,000	21,534	643	823	96	727

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
MICRO WAVE RELAY FAC	DFRP 457		NEW	1,329		1,329	1,329	SF	96
									96

CHAUMONT AIR BASE

The next installation is Chaumont Air Base, located near Chaumont, France. The principal mission is a microwave repeater site. The program amounts to $96,000 which provides for a microwave relay facility. This station will complete the microwave link between Germany, France, and England. The present temporary relay facilities will become obsolete due to mission change to microwave relay. Existing facilities were constructed from salvaged building components and scrap lumber and will be dismantled upon completion of requested item which will fulfill the requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Microwave relay fac, DFRP	U.S. Army Construction Agency	$4.8	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :CIGLI AIR BASE
DIR TO TOWN :13 MI S IZMIR
COUNTY, STATE :TURKEY
COUNTRY
COMMAND :USAFE

PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES :1,790
TOTAL ACRES :1,790

DATE OCC : 1959

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	OAF

EST TOTAL COST ($M)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 60 ($M)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($M)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($M)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($M)	FUTURE YEARS ($M)
10,000		2,536	7,464	5,682	1,782

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($M)
RUNWAY PRIM/INSTRMT	WDN	I		NEW	163,333	106,711	56,622	56,622	SY	1,067
RUNWAY OVERRUNS	ADDN	I		NEW	28,734	8,734	20,000	20,000	SY	160
TAXIWAY RUNWAY ACCES	WDN	I		NEW	132,491	32,141	100,350	13,000	SY	270
APRON OPERATIONAL	ADDN	I		NEW	19,750	14,950	4,800	4,800	SY	95
PAD,POWER CHECK		I		NEW	945		945	945	SY	26
TOWERTCONTROL		I		NEW	1		1	1	EA	66
TEST STAND, JET		I		NEW	1		1	1	EA	28
SHOP,PARA&DINGHY,BSE		I		NEW	4,217		4,217	4,217	SF	136
*FAMILY HOUSING		I		NEW	187		187	110	FA	2,750
DORMITORY,AIRMEN		I		NEW	559	133	426	216	MN	409
DINING HALL, AIRMEN	ADDN	I		NEW	9,764	7,244	2,520	2,520	SF	39
OQ,MEN		I		NEW	69		69	40	MN	265
CLUB,SERVICE		I		NEW	8,500		8,500	8,500	SF	168
ELE. PRIMARY POWER	ADDN	I		NEW	791	441	350	175	KW	70

* From Special Foreign Currency Appropriation to the extent that foreign currencies are available for purchase.

CIGLI AIRBASE

The next installation is Cigli Airbase, located near Izmir, Turkey, and the principal flying mission is tactical fighter aircraft. The request in this program totals $5,682,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item is a runway widening project to provide a minimum width of 150 feet required by high-speed fighter aircraft and larger support aircraft. The present strip is only 98 feet wide.

The next item is a project to provide a total of 1,200 feet of runway overrun to the existing 800 feet of NATO provided overrun. This addition will provide the additional rollout length of 925 feet beyond the barriers necessary for high-speed jet aircraft in the event of an emergency.

The next item provides for the widening of the 62-foot-wide taxiway to 75 feet, which is the minimum width required for operation.

The next item provides an additional 4,800 square yards of operational apron to enable the aircraft to park and maneuver into position under their own power.

The next item is a project for a power check pad. This project is necessary to check out aircraft engines that have been repaired or changed.

The next item provides a control tower. No flight control facility presently exists and this project will provide the necessary flight direction center for all aircraft using the base.

The next item is a project for a jet test stand. This project is required to test engines prior to installation in aircraft and is a function of periodic jet engine maintenance.

The next item is a project for a parachute and dinghy shop of 4,217 square feet. The requested facility is necessary for proper maintenance and repair of both personnel and aircraft drag parachutes.

The next item provides 110 units of family housing for permanent party personnel. There are no adequate family housing units available for rental in the vicinity of the base. The requested units will be made available to officers, upper grade airmen, and key civilian employees.

The next item provides 216 dormitory spaces for airmen. With the previously authorized construction of 133 spaces, this project will complete the requirement for dormitory spaces to accommodate the fighter squadron mission and supporting base personnel.

The next item provides a 2,520 square foot addition to the airmen dining hall to accommodate the additional airmen required by the fighter mission.

The next item is a project to provide a 40-man officers' quarters for single officers and key civilians. There are no existing facilities in the vicinity of the base that can be utilized for this purpose.

The next item is a project to provide a 8,500 square foot service club. There are no off-base recreational facilities available in the vicinity.

The next item provides for 175-kilowatt addition to the primary power generating capacity of the base. This power increase is necessary to support the new projects being requested in this program.

The next item provides for a 2,500-foot electrical distribution system. This project is required to serve the new construction requested in this program.

The next item provides 2,000 feet of sanitary sewage mains to form a sewage collection system.

The next item provides 2,000 feet of water main from the storage point to the structures to be constructed under this program.

The last item requested for this installation is a project to provide an access road of approximately 3,750 feet, connecting the existing public road to the base.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Runway prim/instmt WDN	Unknown	$99.0	0
Runway overruns addn	do	14.0	0
Taxway runway access WDN	do	17.0	0
Apron operational addn	do	5.1	0
Pad, power check	do	1.3	0
Tower control	do	4.2	0
Test stand, jet	do	1.4	0
Shop, para, and dinghy, bse	do	7.5	0
Family housing	do	80.0	0
Dormitory, airmen	do	20.5	0
Dining hall, airmen addn	do	2.2	0
OQ, men	do	13.5	0
Club, service	do	8.4	0
Ele. primary power addn	do	3.5	0
Elec. Distri. line OH	do	1.0	0
San sewage main	do	1.0	0
Water mains	do	1.0	0
Road	do	3.7	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:HAHN AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:12 MI ENE SIMMERN	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:GERMANY	OTHER ACRES	:1,243
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:1,243
COMMAND	:USAFE		
PRINCIPAL MISSION		DATE OCC	: 1952

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
4,800	148	2,525	2,127	248	1,879

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP ARM & ELECTR	71		NEW	12,400		12,400	12,400	SF	248
									248

HAHN AIRBASE

The next installation is Hahn Airbase located near Lautzenhausen, Germany. The principal flying missions are tactical fighter and fighter interceptor aircraft. The program requested for Hahn totals $248,000 for an armament and electronic shop. This type facility is nonexistent at this base. A considerable amount of out of commission time will be experienced, because assemblies must be forwarded to depots for overhaul or repairs. In order to properly maintain and repair the equipment and accessories used in the aircraft for airborne communications, airmament and navigation systems, the requested facility must be provided. This shop will satisfy the full requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop arm. electr	Unknown	$12.5	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:INCIRLIK AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:	OTHER ACRES	:3,396
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:3,396
COMMAND	:USAFE		
		DATE OCC	: 1955
PRINCIPAL MISSION			

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
61,600	40,955	7,636	13,009	621	12,388

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LAB, PREC MEAS EQUI		73		NEW	1,400		1,400	1,400	SF	32
LAUNDRY,BASE		459		NEW	18,000	2,100	15,900	8,000	SF	266
SCHOOL, DEP, INTERME	ADDN	78		NEW	23,600	4,450	19,150	3,639	SF	66
DEPENDENT SCHOOL	ADDN	79		685	19,550	5,950	13,600	11,125	SF	257
										621

INCIRLIK AIRBASE

The next base to be considered is Incirlik Airbase, which is located near Adana, Turkey. This base has a tactical fighter mission and the responsibility of supporting special missions of other services in the area. The program requested amounts to $621,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item is a project for a 1,400-square-foot precision measurement instrument laboratory. This laboratory will maintain and calibrate the highly sensitive equipment used in the maintenance of advanced fighter aircraft.

The next item is a project to provide a combined laundry and drycleaning facility. There are no adequate facilities of this type in the area and suitable laundry facilities are particularly important for operation of the base hospital.

The last two items will provide additions to the intermediate dependent school. There are no adequate local schools in the vicinity of the base and existing structures are not available on base to accommodate this function.

Design information

Line item	Name of architectural engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lab, prec. meas. equip	Unknown	$1.7	0
Laundry base	do	16.0	0
School dep., interme. addn	do	3.3	0
Dependent school addn	Frank E. Basil	15.1	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :RAMSTEIN AIR BASE
DIR TO TOWN :2 MI SW LANDSTUHL
COUNTY, STATE :GERMANY
COUNTRY
COMMAND :USAFE

PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES :3,013
TOTAL ACRES :3,013

DATE OCC 1951

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
6,100	1,303	1,175	3,622	90	3,532

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP, ARM & ELECT. B	72		149	12,400		12,400	4,732	SF	90
									90

Ramstein Airbase

The next base is Ramstein Airbase located 2 miles northeast of Landstuhl, Germany, with the principal flying mission being fighter interceptor and tactical fighter aircraft and also to provide administrative support for Air Force headquarters. The program at Ramstein consists of one item in the amount of $90,000.

This item wil provide a 4,732-square-foot armament and electronic shop. At the present time, this function is being performed in a substandard facility which is being used beyond its full capacity. The requested project will satisfy less than 50 percent of the total requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop, Arm. & Elect. B	Unknown	$5.4	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:SEMBACH AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI W WARTERBERG	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:GERMANY	OTHER ACRES	583
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	583
COMMAND	:USAFE		
		DATE OCC	1953
PRINCIPAL MISSION			

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/MOT	BASE	TRANS/MOT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
5,400	137	1,488	3,775	262	3,513

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SCHOOL DEP ELEM	ADDN	76		149	50,610	21,226	29,384	17,900	SF	262
										262

Sembach Airbase

Sembach Airbase is located near Warterberg, Germany. The principal mission of this base is to support a tactical missile wing. The program requested amounts to $262,000 and consists of one item.

This item will provide an addition of 17,900 square feet to the dependent elementary school which is not sufficient to provide for current and projected enrollment. The requested project will satisfy approximately 80 percent of the total deficiency.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
School dep. elem. addn	Muhlen, Grusan & Duschel	$19	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY - 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:SPANGDAHLEM AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:1 MI SW SEMBACH	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:GERMANY	OTHER ACRES	:1,149
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	:1,149
COMMAND	:USAFE		
		DATE OCC	: 1953

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST ($000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 ($000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($000)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($000)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($000)	FUTURE YEARS ($000)
7,000	858	2,499	3,643	202	3,441

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($000)
HARDSTAND DISP. PARK	WDN	544		NEW	60,250	47,426	12,824	11,354	SY	141
SHELTER A/C READY		545		NEW	12	10	2	2	EA	61
										202

SPANGDAHLEM AIRBASE

The next base to be considered is Spangdahlem Airbase, which is located near Bitburg, Germany. The mission of this base is tactical fighter wing. The program requested amounts to $202,000 for the following two operational items:

The first item will provide for the widening of 32 dispersed aircraft hardstand parking areas. The widening is necessary to permit tactical aircraft to park and maneuver under their own power.

The next item provides two aircraft ready shelters. These shelters will enable the alert aircraft to be in a constant state of readiness to take off under emergency conditions.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Hardstand disp. park WDN	Unknown	$9.0	0
Shelter A/C ready	do	4.1	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:WIESBADEN AIR BASE	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:WIESBADEN	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:GERMANY	OTHER ACRES	: 610
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	: 610
COMMAND	:USAFE		
		DATE OCC	:1945

PRINCIPAL MISSION

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST ($000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 19 ($000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($00)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($00)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($00)	FUTURE YEARS ($00)
3,900	384		3,516	691	2,825

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($00)
SCHOOL DEP.ELEM.-AUK	74		NEW	193,130	115,614	77,516	28,500	SF	428
SCHOOL DEP.HI-HAIN	77		NEW	118,030	52,702	65,328	17,500	SF	263
									691

Wiesbaden Airbase

The next installation is Wiesbaden Airbase, which is located near Wiesbaden, Germany. The principal mission of this base is support of the Air Force headquarters in Europe. The program requested amounts to $691,000 and consists of two dependent school items as follows:

The first item provides an additional elementary school building for the Aukam housing area of the Weisbaden area school complex. Classes are now conducted in such widely dispersed and unsuitable facilities as clubrooms and basements.

The second item provides an addition to Hainerburg High School of the Wiesbaden area school complex. The present high school facilities are overcrowded to such an extent that space is limited to approximately 55 percent of normal space requirements.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
School dep. elem.—AUK	Unknown	$25.0	0
School dep. HI-Hain	do	15.1	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :VARIOUS LOCATIONS
DIR TO TOWN
COUNTY, STATE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :USAFE
PRINCIPAL MISSION

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES
TOTAL ACRES
DATE OCC

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
				13,380	

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TROPOSPHERIC SCATTER		69		NEW	LS		LS		LS	9,780
TROPOSPHERIC SCATTER	ADDN	70		NEW	LS	LS	LS		LS	3,600
										13,380

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

The next projects to be considered concern communications facilities at various locations in Europe. The program requested under this section totals $13,380,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item will provide a link in the worldwide troposcatter communications system at an estimated cost of $9,780,000.

The second item will provide an extension to the troposcatter communications network, at an estimated cost of $3,600,000.

BITBURG AIRBASE, GERMANY

Mr. SHEPPARD. The first item that we shall consider is reflected on page 901 having to do with the Bitburg Airbase. What is the high school situation at Bitburg at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have a school for 73 students. We are using available space made up possibly of sheds and quonset huts that will take care of 116 students. Against our total requirement, then, we are requesting an 18,000-foot school that will take care of 164 students. The temporary sheds and quonset huts that are now being used will be demolished.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is what you are using at the present time, the buildings you just referred to?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

CIGLI AIRBASE, TURKEY

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will pick up next the item having to do with Cigli. That is reflected on page 906 and 907.

What is the present status and mission at this base, including the base rights and land acquisition?

Colonel PARKHILL. Well, sir, for the mission we will soon have ——— F–100's there on tactical rotation and with this program we will build the base up to support a new mission involving ——— F–100 tactical aircraft.

Major WYWAL. We are occupying Cigli Airbase, sir, on the basis of a technical agreement signed November 10, 1959. The U.S. Air Force is the user of the base. It is a Turkish base. Is there any particular question you have in mind?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. What are your base rights as they relate to land acquisition?

Major WYWAL. If I may read from the record, sir, the Turkish Government will provide as mutually agreed to be required land, prepared sites and support facilities, operation and maintenance therefor and such common support equipment as may be available from existing Turkish resources. The last provision is so that Turkey may be reimbursed from NATO funds, at which time the U.S. Government will be reimbursed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long can we stay there under present agreements?

Major WYWAL. As long as the United States and Turkey are bound to NATO, for that period of time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the reason that NATO could not pick up this responsibility under the circumstances instead of having it picked up in this appropriation request?

Major WYWAL. This I do not know offhand, sir. I would be happy to prepare a memorandum for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. See that the answer is provided for the record, please.

Colonel EDMONDS. I think I can answer that, Mr. Chairman. The NATO standards do not provide in the common infrastructure funding for the facilities peculiar to the use of the U.S. Air Force and these facilities that are requested here do not fall within the common item financing that NATO will pay for.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what extent do you propose to use commodity credit funds for the family housing here?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is indicated for surplus commodity funds.

Mr. JONAS. Will you yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. I understood the major to say that later NATO will reimburse Turkey, at which time our Government will be reimbursed, but you say NATO funds cannot be used originally, Colonel.

Colonel EDMONDS. Not for these facilities. The major must be quoting from the general NATO Technical Agreement.

Major WYWAL. Which is incorporated in the agreement with the Government of Turkey.

Mr. JONAS. The statement you originally made in response to the chairman's question would not apply to support facilities?

Colonel EDMONDS. Not to these items, Mr. Jonas. The agreement provides for the funding of certain basic type facilities, and this field was originally designated as a Turkish-use base and it was built under the NATO standards. Then it has been switched to our use and this agreement he is talking about referred to the reimbursement of the Turkish Government for the original construction of the NATO base.

Mr. JONAS. Do you mean the original before we make any additions?

Colonel EDMONDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. There is no provision under the agreement for any reimbursement to our country for installations built on the base after we acquire it?

Colonel EDMONDS. Not unless it is an item which is subject to common infrastructure financing. These items are not. They are peculiar to our needs, most of them.

Mr. JONAS. We are putting or propose to put in $6 million worth of installations on this base in fiscal year 1961 without any agreement as to how long we may be there, or without any provision for reimbursement or recovery?

Major WYWAL. We are there for as long as NATO is in existence, sir.

Colonel EDMONDS. This is similar to the bases we occupied in France. If you will recall, in earlier programs we had to add to those NATO bases anywhere from $15 to $25 million worth of USAF facilities in order to make it usable for USAF forces.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What other community support facilities will be required as a result of this family housing?

Colonel PARKHILL. In this program we have for community facilities a service club. That is the only item in here that falls in that category, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is contemplated in the future? Is there anything that you know of at this time?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am trying to find out, my friend, is this: We go ahead with this. What do we have to do after we do this and add to it?

Obviously, in the normal procedure there are commissaries and various and sundry other things. They form a component part of this. What is your total projection for the future?

Mr. GIBBENS. At the present time under straight appropriated funds we would not propose such things as that other than possibly a portion—well, we are building an exchange sales store there at the present time under a prior program, and we do have a service club in this program. So far as the school is concerned, it would be handled under a different funding.

General Minton stated just a minute ago off the record, and with your permission I would go off the record the same way——

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the tour of duty here, with and without dependents?

Colonel PARKHILL. If this fits the theater requirement, it would be 12 months without dependents and no doubt if we get the housing, it will go up to 3 years.

General MINTON. Let us check that for the record, may we?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

(Information requested is as follows:)

The tour of duty at Cigli is 24 months with dependents and 18 months without dependents.

COST FACTOR

What is the cost factor involved here?

Colonel EDMONDS. The cost factor in that area, Mr. Chairman, is 1.2.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type house are you constructing at a cost of $25,000 per unit?

Colonel GODDARD. We contemplate, Mr. Chairman, using at this location Austrian prefabs, which we have already purchased and have in storage at Trieste. These are frame, single unit structures with asbestos siding, dry wall interior and corrugated asbestos roofing on wood trusses. It will be concrete slab on grade and asphalt tile flooring. The plumbing and certain other fixtures do not come with the prefab. They will have to be purchased. All other work would be done by indigenous labor site work, et cetera.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How close has this cost factor been scrutinized because under normal procedure, using that type structure over there, $25,000 seems to be exorbitant. At the same time, let me ask you this: Did you use local architects or American architects?

Colonel GODDARD. The work in this area is done for the Air Force by the Mediterranean Division of the Army Corps of Engineers. They

retain a combination of American and local architects. I am sure that most of their work in this area is done by U.S. firms employing a certain number of local technical personnel.

I have some detail here, Mr. Chairman, or I can provide it for the record, as to how this cost accumulates, what the various components are. If you do not want to take the time, I can provide you a detailed breakdown. The basic structure will be a prefab purchased from Austria already in storage at Trieste, and around this we will route the balance of the project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those have already been bought and paid for, have they not?

Colonel GODDARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am trying to get at by this interrogation is the $25,000 cost factor. It does not seem consistent.

General MINTON. I agree with you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have the prefabs. They are bought and paid for. Here we find a request for $25,000 a unit. That is not compatible. There is something wrong. What is it?

Colonel GODDARD. I would like to provide a reconciliation for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask a question?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

Mr. SIKES. When were the prefabs bought?

Colonel GODDARD. The prefab houses were bought from Austria for original use in Morocco and during the cutback there they were salvaged, in other words, they were not delivered but were stored at Trieste for later use.

Mr. SIKES. When were they bought?

Colonel GODDARD. I am speaking from memory, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You can correct the record. Just give me the best information you now have.

Colonel GODDARD. They were purchased, to the best of my knowledge, in about 1957.

Mr. SIKES. They have been in storage since that time?

Colonel GODDARD. Yes, sir.

General MINTON. No; they went into storage, actually, just about a year ago, part of them.

Mr. SIKES. Were the houses paid for when they were bought?

Colonel GODDARD. Yes, sir.

These houses were paid for with Austrian schillings.

Mr. SIKES. Do you know what these cost per unit?

Colonel GODDARD. Well, roughly, including the shipment from Austria to the location point storage, it is about $9,500 per unit.

It is in that order of magnitude, $9,000 to $10,000.

Mr. SIKES. That is the prefab house shipped to the present storage point?

Colonel GODDARD. That is right, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That price does not include cost of erection on site?

Colonel GODDARD. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. You still have to do that.

Isn't $9,000 or $10,000 a pretty high cost for a prefab, or the materials in a prefab house in that area?

Colonel GODDARD. No, sir; I do not believe it is. This house is essentially a complete prefab house. It must be mounted on a foundation. It must have utilities brought to it; it must have site development work. I think, considering the source of the currency, the availability of the currency and the method of purchase that this would compare favorably with American products, for example.

Mr. SIKES. Where does the $25,000 cost arise which is reflected in the current budget?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have a shopping list on that?

General MINTON. Do you have a breakdown on the $25,000?

Colonel GODDARD. I have a breakdown with me here. It shows the cost of the prefab, already paid for in the order of magnitude of $967,000; transportation and handling from Trieste to the point of erection, roughly $125,000; erection cost, labor, and other materials not supplied with the package, in other words, the house complete to the 5-foot line, roughly $850,000; the site development and utilities, that is, the roads, streets, grading, et cetera, roughly $350,000; the Corps of Engineers charges for design and supervision, roughly $200,000; and a contingency item of roughly $135,000 to $140,000.

This gets you into an average construction cost in the order of magnitude of $24,000.

I think there may be an error here, including the cost of the prefab in this item and I would like to make a reconciliation for the record.

Mr. SIKES. That has already been paid for so presumably it should not be repeated; is that correct?

Colonel GODDARD. That is correct.

Applying these prefabs to this project, that amount of money could be deleted.

Mr. SIKES. Is this total cost including the original cost of the prefab house in line with the cost of houses elsewhere overseas?

Colonel GODDARD. Yes, sir. I believe it is, because we have a great variation, as you know, sir, in overseas housing costs—Alaska, Ernest Harmon, Goose Bay.

Mr. SIKES. Do you use local labor to erect these houses?

Colonel GODDARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I am surprised at the cost. It would appear to me that we should be able to get this job done for less money. That would buy a very good house and lot in the United States and with the difference in labor costs we should be able to get it done cheaper overseas.

General MINTON. Mr. Sikes, I agree with you. I have a note here. I would like to have the opportunity of reviewing these costs and furnish for the record the revised cost.

Mr. SIKES. Are there any reimbursable factors in this particular item, Colonel?

General MINTON. That may be the explanation of the cost. It may be this is part of the agreement. We may have to reimburse the Department when we use these houses.

Mr. SIKES. Will you assemble that information and place it in the record?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

CIGLI AB, TURKEY, 110-UNIT FAMILY HOUSING PROJECT

When this project was originally programed, it was intended to use local-type masonry construction. All 360 Austrian prefab packages, stored in Trieste, were planned for use at mainsite and site T–10, against fiscal year 1959 and fiscal year 1960 surplus commodity authorizations. The Bureau of the Budget, however, has allocated foreign currencies for only 250 of these, and has declined to allocate the currencies for the construction of the remaining 110 units. In view of this situation, it has been decided to utilize the existing Austrian prefab packages for the Cigli project.

This substitution of prefab construction for masonry construction reduces the funds required as follows:

Total project cost	$2,750,000
Cost of prefab packages (previously financed)	967,000
New funds required for project	1,783,000

The detailed breakdown of the cost of this project is as follows:

A. House to 5-foot line:		
Value of prefab packages		$967,000
Erection costs:		
Transportation of prefabs (Trieste to Cigli)	$124,000	
Erection contract	[1] 844,000	
Government costs	120,000	
Contingencies	103,000	
Total erection		1,191,000
Total cost to 5-foot line		2,158,000
B. Support utilities and site development:		
Contract cost	[2] $482,000	
Government costs	82,000	
Contingencies	28,000	
Total utilities and site development		592,000
C. Total project cost		2,750,000
Cost of prefab packages (previously financed)		967,000
Actual fund requirement		1,783,000

[1] Erection contract cost is somewhat higher than would normally be expected because of the following:

(*a*) The need to replace certain materials which were originally furnished with the prefabs (such as piping, conduits, and anchor bolts) but which were installed in the foundations in Morocco prior to the Morocco cutback.

(*b*) The need to import essentially all materials, equipment, and supervisory personnel required for the project because of nonavailability on the local economy.

[2] The cost of utilities and site development is also increased by the local nonavailability of materials, equipment, and supervisory personnel.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Laird?

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the general could also give us a figure on what housing costs are in Turkey?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Rather than comparing it with overall costs throughout the world for oversea housing, I think it would be helpful to the committee, and it would be helpful to me, if I could see what the costs are in the area that these houses are going to be built as far as native housing is concerned.

(The following was submitted later:)

There is little basis for comparison between construction costs for Turkish economy housing and housing constructed to American standards by U.S. forces.

Turkish economy housing generally is far below American standards, lacking many of the basic necessities for comfort and good health. Room sizes and arrangement are peculiar, especially kitchens and bathrooms, which in most every case are completely inadequate. Closet and storage space is rarely provided. Interior lighting is often a single ceiling fixture and electrical outlets are, when available, limited in number and location. Electrical wiring is usually inferior and underdesigned to the point where American type appliances cannot be used with safety. Central heating, when used, usually is unable to cope with the coldest weather as systems are underdesigned and insulation is nonexistent. Supplementary heat is often required.

A house built to American standards if constructed on the Turkish economy would greatly exceed the cost of similar housing constructed by U.S. forces in that country. First of all, extremely strict customs policies either preclude the import of required materials and equipment or raise the cost to prohibitive levels. Dollar credit shortages further complicate the import situation. Second, interest rates on both speculative and nonspeculative constructions loans are excessively high. Finally, fluctuations in the Turkish currency exchange rate and the disparities in buying power would add greatly to the variance in construction costs for natives and U.S. forces.

No detailed information is available on Turkish economy housing construction. However, for the reasons enumerated it is estimated that a house constructed on the economy to U.S. standards would cost from 40 to 60 percent more than an identical house constructed by U.S. forces.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This base has only been occupied about a year, as I understand it, is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right, sir. It was originally a NATO base, but we have just moved into it recently.

General MINTON. However, we have had headquarters at Izmir, which is the town and we have been based there for some time.

INCIRLIK AIR BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Take the item reflected on page 928.

What is the school situation here at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is Incirlik Airbase. We have a school for 65 students. We need additional school space for a total of 300 students and these two items in the program will satisfy this requirement. They are presently doubled up in the existing school and they are operating on a double shift.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What you are actually providing here is additional space to take care of the excess school attendance, I assume; is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What did you say the total amount was in your backlog?

Colonel PARKHILL. We need a school for a total of 300 students. We need to increase our capacity from our present capability of taking care of 65 students up to 300 students.

SEMBACH AIRBASE, GERMANY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us take next the item, Sembach, reflected on page 931.

What is the school situation at Sembach?

Colonel PARKHILL. We require 29,384 square feet of additional space. We are presently borrowing rooms in the housing area, basements of apartments, that sort of thing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If these two schools are provided, will it take care of your workload insofar as your projected requirement is concerned?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

WIESBADEN AIRBASE, GERMANY

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item is Wiesbaden, reflected on page 936. What is the school situation at this place insofar as your present attendance and requirements are concerned?

Colonel PARKHILL. Our requirement is for 4,557 students and we have available space for, or we have 249,501 square feet, so we have a deficit of 115,920 square feet, and this would include continued use of various scattered buildings around the base that we are presently using.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And in each instance where you are utilizing space at the time what is to be done with the space? Is it still usable space for other purposes, if necessary?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir. In this case it is.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about the others that were referred to previously? Does the same answer apply?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir. In the case of where they are using the temporary huts and quonsets, they will be disposed of.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon these three items, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. LAIRD. No questions.

AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall pick up the next item having to do with Air Force Security Service reflected in the summary table on page 942, which will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The table follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Chicksands Cst Eng	USO	$848
Site 9–T	do	372
Iraklion AS Crete	do	954
Mainsite	do	784
Kirknewton RAF Scot	do	1,162
Site 2–T	do	96
Site I–5	do	460
Shu Lin Kou ASN	do	179
Site 3–T	do	521
Wakkanai ASN Jap	do	2,369
Sand Bag	do	1,032
Total		8,777

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Please place in the record at this point a summary statement of the program for this category.

(The statement follows:)

U.S. Air Force Security Service

The next oversea command is the U.S. Air Force Security Service (USAFSS). The mission of the USAFSS is to provide the communications electronics intelligence for the U.S. Air Force. In addition, this command is organized to perform communications security services which include the storage, distribution, accounting, and maintenance of cryptographic material.

The fiscal year 1961 program provides facilities, amounting to $8,777,000, at 11 oversea locations for the improvement of the basic U.S. Air Force Security Service mission. Nine of these installations for a total of $6,229,000 are located in the European and Mideast areas. Two bases for a total of $2,548,000 are located in the Pacific Air Force area. In addition, $576,000 in the Pacific Air Force area and $283,000 in the Air Materiel Command area are included in the respective command portion of this program.

Facilities are provided to house and support new and improved electronic equipment which is required to increase the capability and effectiveness of the intelligence mission. These facilities include operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administration facilities, troop and family housing, community facilities and utilities.

Three sites, operational facilities, $270,000

Provides a 7,692-square-foot addition to a 10,600-square-foot operations, AFSS building plus alteration to 7,900 square feet of existing building and demolition of 1,200 square feet of unusable space to provide a facility that will be adequate to meet the mission and space requirements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force consisting of over 250 personnel who will jointly use this facility. This operations building will permit elimination of the use of eight vans designed for mobile missions and provide the total space required to enable communications and electronic intelligence data to be made available.

Provides a complete two-stall fire station at one site that is needed for adequate firefighting protection to lives and property and will permit space currently used in an improvised end of the auto maintenance shop to be converted to its intended purpose; and at another site, an addition of 2,210 square feet to a 2,016-square-foot two-stall fire station. The 2,210 square feet will provide personnel quarters, maintenance and supply, dining room, locker room, and toilets, thus providing a complete facility that will be adequate for firefighting activities of the base.

Two sites, maintenance facilities, $182,000

Provides a building for the normal administration functions of the installations engineer at a new base where facilities do not exist to house these functions; and an auto shop for maintenance of assigned administration vehicles that is now being performed in a warehouse building that is considered unusable and will be torn down upon completion of this project.

Six sites, supply facilities, $446,000

Provides paved open storage area at four sites for auto parking and storage of bulky long leadtime items that now are stored in an unpaved area that is a quagmire of mud 5 months of the year; cold storage building for storage and processing of perishable foodstuffs currently being accomplished in five portable boxes which are beyond economical repair, thus causing food spoilage; subsistence storage building for storage of nonperishable foodstuffs in the United Kingdom; shed storage for supplies and equipment now stored in the open that must be stored under shelter; a warehouse adjacent to a communications operations building for storage of operational equipment that are now stored in a tent, a number of Conex containers and outside storage under tarpaulins; and a base warehouse to eliminate a deficiency that exists and creates a condition that necessitates exposed unsecure open storage of equipment and items that normally would be stored inside. A transit cargo warehouse at one site. All of above projects provide 100 percent of the requirement.

Two sites, medical facilities, $239,000

Provides dispensary at one site for treatment and care of base personnel since the mission requires these personnel to work in the vicinity of high-voltage electronic equipment, and an addition to a dispensary for outpatient medical care and to accommodate an increase in personnel programed for fiscal year 1963.

Two sites, administration facilities, $213,000

Provides a 6,000-square-foot addition to the 6,912-square-foot administration office building to contain all base administration personnel in one building and to release currently utilized airmen dormitory space that is critically short; base supply administration building, since critical warehouse space is now being used for this function; and a 4,820-square-foot addition to a 4,930-square-foot group headquarters at an installation under construction.

Four sites, troop housing, $958,000

Provides for construction of a total of 543 airmen dormitory spaces at four locations required to alleviate all or part of the deficiencies that exist.

Two sites, family housing, $3,156,000

Provides for 70 family units at the first location and 108 family units at the second. Off-base facilities are generally either nonexistent, do not come up to American standards, or are insufficient to meet the family housing requirement. These projects provide a portion of the total requirement at each base.

Ten sites, community facilities, $3,148,000

Provides for necessary facilities to accommodate community and recreational activities. Based on specific locations necessitated by assigned missions, this command generally located its sites in isolated areas that are many miles from communities that could provide these type of facilities or in non-English speaking countries where the language barrier is not conducive to normal social activities.

Summary of community facilities

Nomenclature	Scope, cost and construction action	Total
Bakery, bread	1,954 square feet	$112,000
Chapel, base	2,600 square feet, $62,000; 4,205 square feet, $70,000 (DFRP)	132,000
Chapel, annex	2,120 square feet, $15,000; 2,600 square feet, $46,000	91,000
Chapel, with annex	8,970 square feet (DFRP)	145,000
Exchange facilities	16,946 square feet, $322,000 (DFRP), 3,700 square feet, $43,000 (addition).	365,000
Exchange service station	500 square feet	14,000
Exchange, retail, wholesale	5,000 square feet	45,000
Laundry, base	5,173 square feet, $228,000; 4,000 square feet, $141,000; 3,000 square feet, $120,000; 5,300 square feet, $197,000.	686,000
Open mess, NCO	4,400 square feet (DFRP)	160,000
Open mess, officer	6,481 square feet	180,000
Club, service	6,400 square feet, $112,000; 7,000 square feet, $123,000; 7,000 square feet, $103,000.	338,000
Post office, central	1,000 square feet	21,000
Recreation library	1,500 square feet	42,000
Store, commissary	3,500 square feet, $35,000	35,000
Store, clothing sales	4,200 square feet, $70,000; 2,000 square feet, $22,000; 3,300 square feet, $51,000.	153,000
School, dep. elementary	6,280 square feet, $150,000 (addition); 4,550 square feet, $55,000.	205,000
Theater, base	150 seats, $77,000; 150 seats, $158,000	235,000
Theater, chapel	150 seats $96,000; 150 seats, $93,000	189,000
Total		3,148,000

3 Sites, utilities

Provides for an additional water supply storage tank of 60,000 gallons ($25,000) to the existing 60,000 gallons to satisfy a total of 120,000 gallons or 60 percent of the total requirement of 200,000 gallons for normal demand plus a reserve for firefighting in the event the 13-mile-long supply line (from the wells) is broken. It is also required to provide supply capacity for base expansion including other facilities included in this program. Also an additional 60,000 gallons ($55,000) water supply storage tank is provided at a second site to augment the existing 60,000-gallon tank to satisfy 60 percent of the total requirement of 200,000 gallons. The present tank provides no reserve capacity for firefighting and supply other facilities included in this program.

A third site provides a primary sewage treatment and disposal system (300 TD capacity) to overcome a serious threat to the health of the military and civilian personnel at this base ($85,000).

Mr. SHEPPARD. Also insert in the record the pertinent data with respect to each of the individual projects.

(The data follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :RAF CHICKSANDS
DIR TO TOWN : 7 MI SE
COUNTY, STATE :ENGLAND
COUNTRY
COMMAND :AFSS
PRINCIPAL MISSION : RADIO MOBILE GRP

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES
TOTAL ACRES

DATE OCC 1950

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
6,700	959	3,092	2,649	848	1,801

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
AUTO MAINT.SHOP		562		NEW	5,968		5,968	5,968	SF	157
STORAGE.SUBSIST.BASE		566		NEW	3,744		3,744	3,744	SF	45
DORMITORY.AIRMEN	RPMT	575		NEW	635	348	287	210	MN	279
CHAPEL ANNEX		245		NEW	2,120		2,120	2,120	SF	45
EXCHANGE FAC.	DFRP	580		NEW	16,946		16,946	16,946	SF	322
										848

Design information

Line item	Name of architect engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Auto maint shop	British Air Ministry	$7	0
Storage subsist base	do	2	0
Dormitory, airmen, RPMT	do	10	0
Chapel annex	do	2	0
Exchange fac, DFRP	do	16	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION: SITE 9-T
DIR TO TOWN:
COUNTY, STATE:
COUNTRY:
COMMAND: :AFSS
PRINCIPAL MISSION: :RADIO MOBILE SQ

GOVT LEASED:
GOVT OWNED:
OTHER ACRES: 52
TOTAL ACRES: 52
DATE OCC: 1955

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
10,500	6,718	2,162	1,620	372	1,248

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
FIRE STATION,BASE	223		NEW	2,530		2,530	2,530	SF	47
COLD STOR.FOOD.BASE	565		NEW	1,592		1,592	1,592	SF	75
AUTO STORAGE OPEN	568		149	5,825		5,825	3,660	SY	29
OPEN STORAGE BASE	570		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	SY	9
DISPENSARY-B-	230		NEW	1,935		1,935	1,935	SF	95
CHAPEL,BASE	I		NEW	2,600		2,600	2,600	SF	62
WATER SUPPLY STORAGE	587		149	200,000	60,000	140,000	60,000	GA	55
									372

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Fire station, base	Unknown	$2.3	0
Cold storage, food base	do	3.7	0
Auto storage open	Ammann & Whitney	1.9	100
Open storage base	Unknown	1.0	0
Dispensary B	do	4.7	0
Chapel, base	do	3.1	0
Water supply storage	Ammann & Whitney	2.7	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :IRAKLION AIR STA
DIR TO TOWN :10 MI E IRAKLION
COUNTY, STATE :CRETE, GREECE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :AFSS

PRINCIPAL MISSION :RADIO MOBILE GRP

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES : 141
TOTAL ACRES : 141

DATE OCC :1954

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
10,900	6,095	3,008	1,797	954	843

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
WHSE TRANSIT CARGO		561		149	12,250		12,250	12,250	SF	120
BAKERY BREAD		576		149	1,954		1,954	1,954	SF	112
LAUNDRY BASE		238		149	5,173		5,173	5,173	SF	228
* SCHOOL DEP.ELEM.		242		NEW	10,780	4,500	6,280	6,280	SF	150
CHAPEL,BASE W/ANNEX	DFRP	243		NEW	8,960		8,960	8,960	SF	145
EXCHANGE,SERVC.STA		581		NEW	500		500	500	SF	14
OPEN MESS NCO	DFRP	250		149	4,400		4,400	4,400	SF	160
WATER SUPPLY,STORAGE		588		NEW	180,000	120,000	60,000	60,000	GA	25
										954

* From Special Foreign Currency Appropriation to the extent that foreign currencies are available for purchase.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Whse transit cargo	Frank E. Basil	$6.0	100
Bakery bread	do	10.0	100
Laundry base	do	14.0	100
School dep elem	Unknown	7.0	0
Chapel, base w/annex DFRP	do	7.2	0
Exchange, servc, sta	do	.7	0
Open mess NCO DFRP	Frank E. Basil	15.0	100
Water supply, storage	Unknown	1.3	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION: HAINSITE
DIR TO TOWN:
COUNTY, STATE:
COUNTRY:
COMMAND: AFSS
PRINCIPAL MISSION: RADIO MOBILE GRP

GOVT LEASED:
GOVT OWNED:
OTHER ACRES: 819
TOTAL ACRES: 819
DATE OCC: 1957

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
(1) 30,500	7,886	11,964	10,650	784	9,866

(1) Includes Sites 2 and 3

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHED,SUP.&EQP,BASE		567		NEW	4,000		4,000	4,000	SF	33
WHSE,SUP.& EQUIP,BSE		228		NEW	4,000		4,000	4,000	SF	43
DISPENSARY-A-	ADDN	231		NEW	19,248	13,248	6,000	6,000	SF	144
ADMIN,OFFICE		571		NEW	16,650	6,912	9,738	6,000	SF	85
ADMIN.BASE SUPPLY		572		NEW	9,600		9,600	4,000	SF	51
DORMITORY,AIRMEN		235		NEW	1,853	1,296	557	105	MN	227
CHAPEL ANNEX		246		NEW	2,600		2,600	2,600	SF	46
STORE,CLOTHING SALES		247		NEW	4,200		4,200	4,200	SF	70
SEWAGE TREMT & DISP		586		NEW	300		300	300	TD	85
										784

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shed, sup. & eqp, base	Unknown	$1.6	0
Whse, sup & equip, base	do	2.2	0
Dispensary A addn	do	10.4	0
Admin, office	do	5.0	0
Admin base supply	do	2.5	0
Dormitory, airmen	do	11.3	0
Chapel annex	do	2.5	0
Store, clothing sales	do	3.5	0
Sewage tremt & disp	do	5.2	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	:RAF KIRKNEWTON	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	:2 MI NW KIRKNEWTON	GOVT OWNED	
COUNTY, STATE	:SCOTLAND	OTHER ACRES	242
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	242
COMMAND	:AFSS		
		DATE OCC	: 1952
PRINCIPAL MISSION	:RADIO MOBILE SQD		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
5,000	1,576	486	2,938	1,162	1,776

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
* FAMILY HOUSING	234		NEW	209	53	156	70	FA	1,050
CLUB,SERVICE	248		NEW	6,000		6,000	6,000	SF	112
									1,162

* From Special Foreign Currency Appropriation to the extent that foreign currencies are available for purchase.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Family housing	British Air Ministry	$31.5	0
Club service	do	5.5	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION SITE 2-T
DIR TO TOWN
COUNTY, STATE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :AFSS
PRINCIPAL MISSION :RADIO MOBILE SQ

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES :
TOTAL ACRES

DATE OCC : 1956

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/RQT	BASE	TRANS/RQT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 19 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1) 96	(1)

(1) Included in total for MAINSITE

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
THEATER, CHAPEL	252		149	150		150	150	SE	96
									96

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Theater, chapel	Ammann & Whitney	$7	95

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :SITE I-5
DIR TO TOWN
COUNTY, STATE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :AFSS
PRINCIPAL MISSION :RADIO MOBILE SQ

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES : 277
TOTAL ACRES : 277
DATE OCC :PROPOSED

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/MOT	BASE	TRANS/MOT		NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
6,500		3,012	3,488	460	3,028

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
FIRE STATION, BASE	ADDN	224		NEW	4,226		4,226	2,210	SF	44
LAUNDRY, BASE		239		NEW	4,000		4,000	4,000	SF	141
STORE, CLOTHING SALES		577		NEW	2,000		2,000	2,000	SF	32
CLUB, SERVICE		249		NEW	7,000		7,000	7,000	SF	123
EXCHANGE FAC.	ADDN	579		NEW	10,700	4,400	6,300	3,500	SF	43
THEATER		585		149	150		150	150	SE	77
										460

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Fire station base addn	Unknown	$2.2	0
Laundry, base	do	7.0	0
Store, clothing sales	do	1.6	0
Club, service	do	7.0	0
Exchange fac addn	do	3.7	0
Theater	Litchfield, Whiting Bowen, Associates.	8.0	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :SHU LIN KOU AIR STA
DIR TO TOWN
COUNTY, STATE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :AFSS
PRINCIPAL MISSION :RADIO MOBILE SQ

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES 236
TOTAL ACRES 236
DATE OCC : 1955

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
2,000	428	1,020	552	179	373

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
OPERATIONS,AFSS	DFRP	226	NEW	18,292	10,600	7,692	7,692	SF	179
									179

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Operations, AFSS DFRP	Unknown	$10	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION SITE 3-T
DIR TO TOWN
COUNTY, STATE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :AFSS
PRINCIPAL MISSION :RADIO MOBILE SQ

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES : 10
TOTAL ACRES : 10

DATE OCC :1956

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)		FUTURE YEARS (000)
(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	521	(1)

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	*AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
WHSE,SUP,& EQUIP,BSE	229		NEW	11,208	5,608	5,600	5,600	SF	47
DORMITORY,AIRMEN	236		NEW	386	264	122	122	MN	261
LAUNDRY,BASE	240		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	SF	120
THEATER, CHAPEL	253		149	150		150	150	SE	93
									521

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Whse, sup. & equip, bse	Unknown	$2.3	0
Dormitory, airmen	do	13.0	0
Laundry, base	do	6.3	0
Theater, chapel	Ammann & Whitney	7.0	95

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. AIR FORCE

STATION :WAKKANAI AIR STA
DIR TO TOWN :2 MI SE WAKKANAI
COUNTY, STATE :JAPAN
COUNTRY
COMMAND

GOVT LEASED
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES : 184
TOTAL ACRES : 184

DATE OCC :1946

PRINCIPAL MISSION :RADIO MOBILE SQ

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
6,000	546	1,054	4,400	2,369	2,031

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
* FAMILY HOUSING		109		NEW	193		193	108	FA	2,106
* SCHOOL DEP. ELEM		112		NEW	4,550		4,550	4,550	SF	55
CHAPEL,BASE	DFRP	115		NEW	4,205		4,205	4,205	SF	70
* STORE COMMISSARY		116		NEW	3,500		3,500	3,500	SF	35
SERVICE CLUB		118		NEW	7,000		7,000	7,000	SF	103
										2,369

* From Special Foreign Currency Appropriation to the extent that foreign currencies are available for purchase.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Family housing	Unknown	$63.0	0
School dep. elem	do	2.7	0
Chapel, base DFRP	do	5.0	0
Store commissary	do	3.0	0
Service club	do	5.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY — 1961 — AIR FORCE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION :SAND BAG
DIR TO TOWN
COUNTY, STATE
COUNTRY
COMMAND :APSS

GOVT LEASED : 811
GOVT OWNED
OTHER ACRES : 68
TOTAL ACRES : 879

DATE OCC :1958

PRINCIPAL MISSION :RADIO MOBILE GRP

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST ($000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 ($000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY ($00)	BALANCE REQUIRED ($00)	FY 1961 REQUEST ($00)	FUTURE YEARS ($00)
9,000		5,005	3,995	1,032	2,963

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT ($00)
INSTALL.ENGR.ADMIN		563		NEW	1,600		1,600	1,600	SF	25
IE STORAGE OPEN		564		149	3,110		3,110	3,110	SY	20
AUTO STORAGE OPEN		569		149	3,880		3,880	3,880	SF	25
HQ,GROUP,AIR BASE	ADDN	573		NEW	9,750	4,930	4,820	4,820	SF	77
DORMITORY,AIRMEN		237		NEW	743	558	185	106	MN	191
LAUNDRY BASE		241		149	6,100	800	5,300	5,300	SF	197
STORE,CLOTHING SALES		578		NEW	3,300		3,300	3,300	SF	51
EXCHANGE RET. WHSE		582		NEW	5,000		5,000	5,000	SF	45
OPEN MESS OFFICER		251		685	6,481		6,481	6,481	SF	180
POST OFFICE,CENTRAL		583		NEW	1,000		1,000	1,000	SF	21
RCTN,LIBRARY		584		NEW	1,500		1,500	1,500	SF	42
THEATER,BASE		254		NEW	150		150	150	SE	158
										1,032

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Instal, engr, admin	Unknown	$1.2	0
IE storage open	Dist, engineer	1.1	100
Auto storage open	do	1.4	100
Hq group, air base addn	Unknown	3.8	0
Dormitory, airmen	do	9.5	0
Laundry base	Frank E. Basil	12.3	100
Store, clothing sales	Unknown	2.5	0
Exchange ret, whse	do	2.2	0
Open mess officer	TAMS	9.0	0
Post office, central	Unknown	1.0	0
Retn, library	do	2.1	0
Theater, base	do	7.9	0

Mr. SHEPPARD. With reference to those pages, I ask: What are you using for existing exchange facilities at Chicksands?

Colonel PARKHILL. We are presently using a temporary type of messhall that was constructed during World War II and we would propose to demolish this structure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the situation at site I–5?

Colonel PARKHILL. I–5 is in San Vito, Italy. We have an existing post exchange of 4,400 square feet, and we propose to add 3,500 square feet to support an increased mission at this base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Increased mission requiring how many persons?

Colonel PARKHILL. The total military strength now will be ——— military and 59 Air Force civilians.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are also requesting schools at Iraklion. What are you using for schools here at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. At Iraklion, Crete, presently for our elementary school we have a small building that has two classrooms. We are also using tents and huts. We need space for 94 more students.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you need the additional space?

Colonel PARKHILL. It is to replace the temporary huts that we are using at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How about Japan? Does the same answer apply?

Colonel PARKHILL. In Wakkanai, Japan, we have a requirement for a school for 65 children. They have no space available at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What family housing do you have there?

Mr. KINTER. There is no existing family housing on Wakkanai at the present time, sir.

Colonel PARKHILL. There is a family housing item in this program. These two would go together.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what you are providing for, then, is your school operations in conjunction with the contemplated family housing project; is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right, sir.

In addition, we have the store commissary. They have none available. These three items would be for surplus commodity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are requesting housing at Kirknewton in Scotland as well as Japan. What is the housing situation at these locations at the present time?

Mr. KINTER. At Kirknewton, Scotland, sir, we have a gross requirement for 209 units. There are 53 units, surplus commodity previously programed at that place, and we are asking for 70 units in this program which will give us a total of 59 percent of our requirements satisfied.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you going to do about the balance of your percentage?

Mr. KINTER. They will be required to live in the local community, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the tour of duty at these two stations with and without dependents?

Colonel PARKHILL. May I furnish that for the record, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

(The information requested follows:)

If housing is provided, the minimum accompanied tour at Wakkanai, Japan, will be 24 months. To date, no official accompanied tour has been established by Headquarters USAF. Effective July 1, 1960, the tour for bachelor personnel and married personnel not accompanied by dependents will be 15 months.

The accompanied tour at Kirknewton, Scotland, is 36 months. Married personnel not accompanied by dependents serve a 24-month tour. Bachelor personnel serve a 36-month tour.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type housing construction do you contemplate in these two instances, gentlemen?

Colonel GODDARD. At Kirknewton, sir, we plan to follow the general plan we followed throughout the British Isles, which consists of row housing, two story, primarily fourplex and sixplex, with just a small number of duplexes and singles. It is masonry first floor, frame second floor. Generally no basements, slab on grade. We have a standard builtup roof, dry-wall interior, wood frame, and hardwood flooring.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would be the unit cost factor here?

Colonel GODDARD. About $15,000 per unit, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What portion of the project requested for the Air Force Security Service do you propose to finance with foreign currencies?

Colonel PARKHILL. Dollarwise, 38 percent of the oversea package for the Security Service.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Further questions on this item?

Mr. SIKES. I have no questions.

Mr. JONAS. I have no questions.

OVERSEA FAMILY HOUSING COST DATA

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder when you furnish the unit cost of family housing if we can show the support money also? Some of these costs must include support funds, such as sewer, streets, and so forth, because they are quite high.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you produce that for the record, gentlemen?

Colonel PARKHILL. Very well.
(The information requested follows:)

Oversea family housing cost data

[Dollars in thousands]

Country	Base	Number of units	Cost to 5-foot line [1]		Support items [1]	Total project cost
			Total cost	Unit cost		
Japan	Wakkanai	108	[2] $1,332	[2] $12.3	[2] $774	$2,106
	Itazuke	200	2,154	10.8	146	2,300
	Misawa	275	2,966	10.8	197	3,163
	Yokota	200	2,154	10.8	146	2,300
Philippines	Clark	400	4,674	11.7	1,326	6,000
Turkey	Cigli	110	[3] 2,158	19.6	592	[4] 2,750
United Kingdom	Kirknewton	70	882	12.6	168	1,050

[1] All costs shown include Government costs (construction supervision and inspection and construction agency overhead) and contingencies.
[2] Wakkanai. Remote location results in a general increase in construction costs and also requires installation of all utilities including powerplant, water supply, and storage facilities.
[3] Cigli. Cost to 5-foot line includes the following:

Value of prefab package procured originally for Morocco (in storage in Trieste)	$967,000
Transportation of prefabs, Trieste to Cigli	124,000
Erection including foundations, floor slabs, and prefab erections, plus Government costs and contingencies	1,067,000
Total	2,158,000

[4] Cigli. $2,750,000 represents total cost of project; however, $967,000 of this cost has already been financed (see note 3 above). Therefore, actual fund requirement for the Cigli project will be $1,783,000 ($2,750,000 minus $967,000).

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING STATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall take up aircraft control and warning stations and insert the summary sheet on page 1014.
(The summary follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Brevoort Island DEW line	ADO	$216
Cape Dyer DEW station	ADO	66
Cape Hooper DEW station	ADO	97
Cartwright Air Station	ADO	54
Clinton Point DEW station	ADO	142
Fort Nelson DEW line	ADO	154
Gander	ADO	300
Hall Lake DEW station	ADO	173
Hopedale Air Station	ADO	246
Melville Air Station	ADO	210
Nicholson Peninsula	ADO	156
Padloping Island DEW line	ADO	97
Saglek Air Station	ADO	398
Shepherd Bay DEW station	ADO	147
St. Anthony Air Station	ADO	54
Tuktoyaktuk DEW station	ADO	125
Pinetree radar improvement	ADO	15,000
Gap fillers	ADO	6,000
Total		23,637

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, please insert a summary statement concerning the projects under this category.
(The statement follows:)

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEMS

Facilities are provided in this program for the improvement and operational capability of the A.C. & W. system in Canada to augment the movement of the air defense combat zone northward. The major part of the fiscal year 1961 A.C. & W. program in Canada is for the erection of radar towers to support improved electronic equipment for warning and control of aircraft. The second part of this improvement program provides for the installation of gap fillers to cover low altitude areas, not presently covered by main A.C. & W. stations. Also included are required personnel facilities for existing A.C. & W. stations along the Pinetree line and erection of small prefabricated warehouses now stockpiled at DEW line sites together with the construction of one equipment maintenance shop for centralized maintenance of DEW line heavy-type equipment. These items total $23,637,000 and are subdivided as follows:

1. Base warehouse and equipment supply facilities, $940,000

Provides for the construction required in Canada to erect six prefabricated supply buildings now stockpiled at these DEW line sites, together with service utilities support. Warehouse space is required to store the annual sealift tonnage, consisting of 15 months' supply of bulk food, dry cargo, electronic and vehicular spaces, at the following locations in Canada: Brevoort Island, Clinton Point, Fort Nelson, Nicholson, Pa., Shepherd Bay, and Tuktoyaktuk.

2. TACAN facility, $66,000

Project is needed for terminal aid to aircraft landing at Cape Dyer (DEW site), Canada, and aircraft en route to Thule.

3. Water storage tanks, $194,000

Water storage tanks at Padloping Island and Cape Hooper, Canada, both DEW line stations, are required at these isolated sites, to alleviate the acute water storage problems. During the prolonged winter months, the only available supply is obtained by melting of ice, which is costly, time consuming, and unsatisfactory and endangers the health and morale of assigned personnel.

4. Officers quarters, $216,000

Facilities are required for housing officers and civilians of officer grade at four isolated A.C. & W. sites in Canada to fulfill a minimum requirement. This requirement includes quarters for military, Air Force civilians and contractor maintenance civilians. The sites involved are as follows: Cartwright Air Station, Hopedale Air Station, Saglek Air Station, and St. Anthony Station.

5. Addition to operations building, $300,000

Project at Gander Air Station, Canada, is needed to provide adequate facilities for the manually operated ground air communications system of the air defense section. The structure will house the flight size display equipment, reproduction equipment, and console. No other building is available to meet this new requirement.

6. Heavy equipment maintenance shop, $175,000

Provides for the construction of a centrally located heavy equipment maintenance shop for the overall DEW line heavy equipment maintenance requirements. The present method for maintenance of DEW line heavy equipment is dispersed, time consuming, and costly to an unacceptable degree. This shop will allow this maintenance to be carried out centrally at Hall Lake DEW station, and will allow for proper stockage of heavy maintenance parts, reduced downtime for the equipment, reduced cost of maintenance, and permit a higher degree of operational capability to be maintained.

7. Airmen dormitories, $402,000

Two isolated A.C. & W. locations in Canada, Melville Air Station and Hopedale Air Station, do not have required housing space for the assigned personnel. It is necessary to double up airmen and transients, using existing lounges, tower bases, and corridors to alleviate this situation. At Hopedale, the total requirement is for 191 spaces. We have existing 140 spaces, leaving a deficit of 51 spaces. The requested program will satisfy 85 percent of the total requirement. At Melville a similar condition exists. The programed request will satisfy 80 percent of the requirement.

8. Personnel facility (1 A.C. & W. site), $344,000

Provides for complete housing and messing facility at Saglek Air Station, Canada, an isolated A.C. & W. site on the northern tip of Labrador. The facility

is to be located adjacent to the site runway a distance of approximately 3 miles from the main site. The main site is located atop the windswept rocky coast of the area. Transportation to and from the main site to the runway is impossible for periods as long as 2 weeks during the recurring severe winter months. A small crew of 17 maintenance personnel are required to live and work at the runway site during the winter. Incoming and outgoing personnel are frequently isolated at the runway area and must be housed and fed until the weather permits their movement back to the main site.

9. Gap fillers, various locations, $6,000,000

Provides for the construction necessary to support the installation of gap fillers along the Pinetree-CADIN line in connection with the program for the advancement of combat capability north of the continental United States. It is necessary to provide low altitude coverage and closure of gaps remaining in the radar coverage after installation of the presently programed frequency diversity prime radars in this program.

10. Radar improvement, Pinetree-Cadin radars, $15,000,000

Provides construction to support radar improvement of various sites located along the Pinetree-Cadin line. This project is in connection with the approved program for advancement of the warning and combat capability north of the continental United States. It will improve, advance, and integrate this defense capability, by the construction of frequency diversity radars, power additions, required utilities, and support items.

DESIGN INFORMATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Finally, insert a table giving the appropriate design information relating to the various projects.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Design information—A. C. & W.—outside United States

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Whse, sup, and equip bse	Federal Electric Corp	$6.5	0
TACAN station, fixed	Unknown	2.0	0
Water storage tank	Federal Electric Corp	4.9	0
OQ men	Unknown	4.0	20
Whse, sup, and equip bse	Federal Electric Corp	4.5	0
Do	do	4.4	0
Ops A. C. & W	Unknown	9.0	0
Shop heavy equip dep	Federal Electric Corp	16.0	0
Dorm airmen	Unknown	7.0	0
OQ men	do	4.0	0

Design information—ADO

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Dorm airmen	Unknown	$6.0	0
Whse, sup, and equip bse	Federal Electric Corp	4.5	0
Water, storage tank	do	4.9	0
Personnel facility	Unknown	17.0	0
OQ men	do	4.0	0
Whse, sup, and equip base	Federal Electric Corp	4.5	0
OQ men	Unknown	4.0	0
Whse, sup, and equip bse	Federal Electric Corp	4.5	0

PINETREE LOCATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the relationship between the Pinetree construction requested here and the so-called CADIN agreement?

Colonel NICHOLS. The construction in this program is for facilities that are outside the CADIN agreement. They are extension of the Pinetree effort that we have in Canada.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are they?

Colonel PARKHILL. This consists of frequency diversity for the U.S.-operated sites in Canada. It is a $15 million package. I do not have the exact sites spelled out. This will provide for the anti-jamming capability and greater operational effectiveness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you supply information on this question?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is strictly an expenditure of the United States in which Canada has no participation?

Colonel NICHOLS. The equivalent we are providing, sir, is U.S.-procured equipment and this is our contribution under the Pinetree agreement.

(The information requested follows:)

The fiscal year 1961 military construction program includes the construction of the following frequency diversity radar towers and electrical power at the following Canadian locations:

Location	*Description*
Ramore Air Station	FPS–27 tower and additional power.
Armstrong Air Station	FPS–27 tower and additional power.
Baldy Hughes Air Station	FPS–27 tower and additional power.
Molsie Air Station	FPS–27, FPS–26 tower, new powerplant.
Sydney Air Station	FPS–27, FPS–26 tower, new powerplant.
Barrington Air Station	FPS–27, FPS–26 tower and additional power.
Lowther Air Station	FPS–27, FPS–26 tower and additional power.
Sioux Lookout Air Station	FPS–7, FPS–26 towers.
Puntzi Mountain Air Station	FPS–7, FPS–26 towers and additional power.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you tell me what the status is of the equipment for these proposed Pinetree locations?

Colonel NICHOLS. This equipment is called for in the procurement both for 1960 and 1961.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it ready for procurement as of the present time?

Colonel NICHOLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the delivery time required?

Colonel NICHOLS. Eighteen months.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How will this addition improve the present Pinetree operations? What benefits will we get from it?

Colonel NICHOLS. In the operational sense, sir, the equipment will truly replace obsolete equipment, bringing it to a level of capability commensurate with modern electronic radars. Those we have in the United States as well as those we have in some areas overseas will be affected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will occur with the obsolete mechanical devices you are replacing?

Colonel NICHOLS. Sir, the equipment that they will replace is 10 or more years old and would be classified in the category of items to be salvaged.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, they will be declared surplus to the requirements; is that right?

Colonel NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And disposed of accordingly?

Colonel NICHOLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will this complete the construction on this line?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir. We estimate possibly another $5 million will be needed for the 1962 construction program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You do not anticipate any difficulty in this equipment delivery time schedule, do you?

Colonel NICHOLS. There is no anticipated difficulty in the production or production delivery of the electronic equipment associated with this construction, none whatsoever.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many appropriations are handling the cost of power erection or power procurement for this line?

Colonel NICHOLS. Two; P–300 and P–400.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would you be more explicit?

Colonel NICHOLS. P–300 is the construction area, sir. P–400 is an area in which we include such things as installation costs. This is the O and M funding area in which we include installation efforts.

GAP FILLER SITES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the equipment planned for the gap filler sites?

Colonel NICHOLS. May I assume, sir, that you are aware of previous testimony that has been made to Congress that we have asked the commander, Norad, to come back with a program resulting from the recent Air Defense reorientation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel NICHOLS. On that assumption, sir, if you are aware we have asked him that, the answer we can make is that the exact number is under study at the moment awaiting comparison of Commander Norad's return recommendations to the Washington area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as you know at the present time, even with this hiatus you have referred to, will this complete the gap filler requirement or will that answer have to wait since we have not had that report?

Colonel NICHOLS. We can give you a positive answer, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

Colonel NICHOLS. Under the current plan this does not complete the gap filler program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What percentage in your opinion will be left incomplete?

Colonel NICHOLS. As an opinion, sir, pertaining only to the area north of the border, that geographical area, this is on the magnitude ——— of this year: therefore, ———.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What specific coverage will these fillers give you that you do not have in this area at the present time?

Colonel NICHOLS. This will fill an operational deficiency at the lower altitudes that will permit radar coverage compatible with our plans for actual interceptors at the lower altitudes. It is to fill low altitude deficiency north of the border to permit interceptor type control.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I assume it is considered a very important part of the total operation within that area. Is that correct?

Colonel NICHOLS. A very high priority operational need; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How do we find it in the last 25 percent of your priority requirement if it is an extremely high priority requirement in the first instance you mentioned?

General MINTON. That is very high priority in his area of influence. We have to balance this against the entire budget requirement, and in our opinion it is not quite that high a priority.

Colonels NICHOLS. I was speaking operationally as compared to other operational needs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can understand the reason for the differences of opinion, gentlemen, when it comes to priorities.

Questions on the item?

REPLACEMENT OF EQUIPMENT

Mr. SIKES. Is the equipment which you are replacing obsolete, or worn out, or both?

Colonel NICHOLS. The heavy radar equipment to which we referred?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, in the Pinetree operation.

Colonel NICHOLS. It is obsolete in its capability to perform the operational mission. It is obsolescent from the standpoint of having been used for extended years.

If that is evasive I do not mean it to be so. Yes, sir, it is worn out. Yes, sir, it is operationally inadequate, both.

Mr. SIKES. Is it operationally inadequate because of the improvements of the enemy's capabilities or because of improvements in our abilities to develop improved radars?

Colonel NICHOLS. Both questions may be answered in the affirmative.

Mr. SIKES. The state of the art is progressing on both sides?

Colonel NICHOLS. Yes, sir, very definitely.

Mr. SIKES. Is the present Pinetree line equipment inadequate for the purpose for which it was designed?

Colonel NICHOLS. In view of the altitude capability of the threat, yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What will the new equipment do to remove that limitation which presently exists with current equipment?

Colonel NICHOLS. It will improve radar coverage in the sense of range and altitudes. We can see higher; we can see farther.

Mr. SIKES. High enough and far enough to cope with the most modern planes which the Russians might be able to send over?

Colonel NICHOLS. Yes, sir; within the state of the electronic art. These are the best radars that the state of the art will permit.

Mr. SIKES. Do you foresee a further improvement in the art of aircraft which might make this equipment obsolete within several years, 3, 4, or 5 years?

Colonel NICHOLS. Within the phraseology of aircraft, no sir. We feel this is quite capable of coping for many, many years. We do not foresee anything in the development horizon for aircraft that this equipment should not be able to detect.

Mr. SIKES. Has new equipment been so designed as to eliminate weaknesses in the earlier equipment?

Colonel NICHOLS. In these equipments, such technical terms as "maintainability," "reliability," and these normal support-type words, yes, sir. These equipments are designed to remove those as completely as the state of the art will permit. Professional opinion throughout the Air Force is unanimous that these equipments do remove those earlier deficiencies.

Mr. SIKES. Are there recognized weaknesses even in the most modern equipment?

Colonel NICHOLS. Within the state of the art we must answer this one in the negative. We do not know of any significant weakness in this one which would warrant our not going ahead with it.

Mr. SIKES. How long has this new equipment been tested?

Colonel NICHOLS. There are two major radar equipments involved. One has been in operation for approximately a year.

The second was placed into test approximately 1 year ago, and we are at the termination of those tests at this point and time.

Mr. SIKES. Are you confident the bugs have been eliminated now and will not have to be eliminated after this equipment has been placed in the Pinetree line?

Colonel NICHOLS. The bugs have been eliminated, sir, to the degree that one encounters in all test programs at this point and time.

We are at the end of tests on the second set. We now must go ahead with those normal to be expected production changes to that service test item, but they are production type changes as distinguished from a redesign of the set. The answer then is in the affirmative, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I have no questions.

Mr. LAIRD. I have no questions.

MINOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record at this point a tabulation showing the projects approved in fiscal 1960 for minor new construction and those in process at the present time.

(The information requested follows:)

Fiscal year 1960 U.S. Air Force minor construction projects approved or in process

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Base	PRN	Description	Approved	In process
Eielson	60-8	Addition to telephone exchange building 304	$75,000	
Do	369-0	VHF-TVOR Big Delta		$15,411
Elmendorf	153-9	Communication ducts and manholes	25,000	
Do	121-0	Extend rapcon facilities	36,500	
Ladd	60-8	Weather facility, Tatalina	63,683	
Ladd (Galena)	95-0	Arresting barrier		153,000
Do	28-8	Storage, base liquid fuel		135,000
Ladd (Murphy Dome)	143-9	A.C. & W. addition	49,900	
Ladd (Galena)	90-9	Overrun, west end runway		125,000
Elmendorf (King Salmon)	163-9	Airfield lighting		149,330
Subtotal			250,083	577,741
		Major command approval projects	45,346	50,276
Command total			295,429	628,017

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Armstrong	25-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 4	$21,800	
Do	26-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 5	21,800	
Beaverbank	1-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 2	19,900	
Do	2-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 3	19,900	
Charleston	11-9	Taxiway, apron access		$36,900
Ent	173-0	Addition to building 4, COC Norad	47,000	
Do	55-9	Addition to building 5-39 (dental clinic)		37,700
Do	114-8	Addition to building 5-21 (ex/snack bar)		49,000
Glasgow	20-9	Readiness crew addition		30,750
Grand Forks	11-0	Power check pad		49,700
Do	1-8	Readiness crew addition		30,750

Fiscal year 1960 U.S. Air Force minor construction projects approved or in process—Continued

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND—Continued

Base	PRN	Description	Approved	In process
Kingsley	34-6	Refuel vehicle storage, open		26,480
Malmstrom	119-8	Readiness crew addition		30,750
Minot	18-0	Chrome-cobalt lab; addition to dental clinic		40,500
Otis	0-8-9	Taxiway lighting		22,800
Do	0-9-9	do		15,400
Do	0-12-9	do		17,900
Pagwa	27-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 4	$21,500	
Do	28-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 5	17,000	
Paine	9-0	Shop, armament and electronic	184,000	
Do	10-0	Shop, aircraft engine inspection and repair	192,000	
Ramore	37-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 4	14,400	
Do	38-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 5	14,400	
St. Sylvestre	4-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 2	24,400	
Do	5-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 3	24,400	
Selfridge	10-0	Weather Facility, Building 559		42,000
Do	104-0	Warehouse, supply and equipment, base		150,000
Sioux Lookout	33-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 4	16,000	
Do	34-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 5	16,000	
Sydney	6-0	do	16,200	
Do	7-0	Addition, tower, radar No. 6	16,200	
Tonapah	38-0	FPS-6, utilities (support)	18,500	
Do	37-0	do	18,500	
Wright-Patterson	182-9	Aircraft engine shop	122,000	
Ent	114-8	Base exchange		25,000
Subtotal			845,900	605,630
		Maj comd apprvl projects	808,827	1,134,318
Comd total			1,654,727	1,739,948

AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

Hill	61-7	Radome shop		$53,500
Do	8-9	Multicubicle magazine	$161,000	
Kelly	42-0	Underground electric		72,300
Do	24-9	Weather facility 2277 and 2278	43,700	
Loring	102-9	Install slop tanks	41,400	
Norton	122-7	Weather observation buidling	37,400	
Robins	12-0	Metal building SAC field maintenance	62,100	
Do	87-0	Weather facilities	47,000	
Do	47-8	Storage, chemicals, base		25,000
Tachikawa	142-0	Dependent school	164,800	
Do	22-0	do	79,000	
Do	31-0	Utility sheds		75,000
Wright Patterson	458-0	Liquid oxygen generator, area C		45,200
Brookley	96-0	Addition to building 291, sec. A, shipping and receiving		14,000
Griffiss	128-0	Addition to building 123	15,240	
Norton	148-9	Electric distribution line, UG	63,500	
Subtotal			715,140	285,000
		Major command approval projects	105,700	205,000
Command total			820,840	490,000

AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND

Holloman	22-0	Construct test track, shop	$48,600	
Do	24-0	Water supply, Douglas-Boles	80,500	
Do	32-9	TACAN station	35,600	
Do	40-0	Test track engineer buildings	175,000	
Do	8-DR2	G/M data observation station	37,500	
L. G. Hanscom	94-8	Runway overrun	142,000	
Edwards	191-8	Communication ducts	49,000	
Eglin	126-9	Electric distribution lines, OH	104,100	
Do	102-0	Telephone exchange	174,800	
Patrick	85-0	Artesian wells, housing area		$50,000
Subtotal			847,100	50,000
		Major comd approval projects	245,512	363,750
Command total			1,092,612	413,750

Fiscal year 1960 U.S. Air Force minor construction projects approved or in process—Continued

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Base	PRN	Description	Approved	In process
Amarillo	63-0	Addition, dental clinic		$35,800
Do	11-1	Petroleum, oil, and lubricants, quality control laboratory		33,100
Brooks	18-0	Addition, animal holding facility		74,300
Chanute	27-0	Construct BOMARC shelter	$142,900	
Lackland	255-0	Range, Camp Bullis (rifle)	47,000	
Lowry	110A-9	Construct F-106 trainer power facility	190,700	
Do	205-0	Construct G/M checkout building		65,000
Randolph	163-9	Construct east substation	163,900	
Sheppard	178-0	Acquire 5 buildings		33,700
Do	179-0	Acquire 3 buildings		41,300
Stead	34-8	Small arms range	72,500	
Do	66-8	Shop, electronics base	27,700	
Do	65-8	Shop, aircraft engine I. & R	27,200	
Do	34-0	Construct laboratory precision Meas		41,500
Vance	47-1	Addition, jet engine test cell		36,300
Webb	114-8	Test stand, jet		65,800
Subtotal			671,900	426,800
		Major command approval projects	234,321	−48,300
Command total			906,221	475,100

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell	82-8	Extend steam lines		$192,700
		Major command approval projects	$44,904	107,042
Command total			44,904	299,742

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews	77-0	Addition, shop building for "Lyda Rose"	$45,000	
Do	105-0	Addition, fire station		$48,500
Do	116-1	Apron, operational		156,000
Subtotal			45,000	204,500
		Major command approval projects	66,995	95,370
Command total			111,995	299,870

MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE

Charleston	10-9	Test stand, jet	$41,300	
Dover	138-9	Water alcohol, storage	47,800	
Keflavik	125-9	Jet engine test facility	45,000	
Do	1-1	Telephone cable, addition		$41,500
Lajes	84-0	Road		41,500
McClellan	76-0	Erect squadron operations building	25,200	
McGuire	74-9	Addition, wing headquarters		146,000
Scott	6-9	Addition, telephone exchange	177,900	
Torrejon	131-0	Addition, Pax Terminal		28,000
Tachikawa	148-8	Maintenance dock	35,300	
Travis	209-9	Demineralized water facility	47,000	
Do	286-0	Extend fuel loading system		74,200
Subtotal			419,500	331,200
		Major command approval projects	103,494	397,001
Command total			522,994	728,201

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Clark		Addition, communications building		$87,000
Osan	K-55-60	Equip calibration shop	$29,600	
Do	K-55-7	Communication receiver building	31,100	
Do	K-55-8	Communication transmitter building	26,300	
Kadena	604-0	Headquarter Group Air Base		100,700
Do	750-0	Multicubicle magazine		160,000
Naha	601-0	Maintenance dock	99,200	
Do	600-0	do	99,000	

Fiscal year 1960 U.S. Air Force minor construction projects approved or in process—Continued

PACIFIC AIR FORCE—Continued

Base	PRN	Description	Approved	In process
Taiwan	25-9	Alternate communications center	$80,000	
Yokota	403-0	Relocate ammo maintenance shop	27,900	
Do	24-0	Repair shop, base	30,000	
Do	450-0	Shelter aircraft ft weapons calibration		$31,400
Do	404-0	Switching station	39,100	
Taiwan		Readiness crew building	38,000	
Tachikawa	210-0	Maint docks (2)	140,000	
Do	141-9	Hosp addition		66,800
Subtotal			640,200	445,900
		Major command approval projects	237,000	250,865
Command total			877,200	696,765

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Carswell	13-9	RBS facility	$37,700	
Eglin	188-9	Sq opns and target intell addition		$40,000
Ellsworth	86-9	Target range		48,900
Forbes	72-9	Convert for communications building	67,700	
Vandenberg	521-9	Trailer court		106,100
Yokota	417-6	Sq opns	32,000	
Do	418-6	Arm & elec shop	46,000	
Subtotal			183,400	195,000
		Major command approval projects	989,269	1,192,545
Command total			1,172,669	1,387,545

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

England	60-0	Hospital addition		$175,000
Nellis	178-0	Shop, aircraft maintenance field	$60,000	
Do	179-0	Shop, armature and electronic	200,000	
Do	180-0	Shop, aircraft engine inspection and repair	140,000	
Do	173-0	3-power check pads	43,100	
Orlando	22E-9	Supply warehouse	34,000	
Do	175-9	Calibration shop	67,700	
Seymour-Johnson	175-0	Road, bridge		42,000
Subtotal			544,100	217,000
		Major command approval projects	133,500	198,900
Command total			678,300	415,900

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Alconbury		Power check pad	$88,000	
Do		Jet blast deflectors	38,000	
Do	3E-0	Photo lab recondition	175,000	
Do		Road	30,000	
Do		Alert crew quarters	50,000	
Do		Squadron operations building	122,000	
Bruntingthorpe		T/W lighting	93,000	
Do		OQ men	45,000	
Chelveston		T/W lighting	156,000	
Etain	64-9	Road, housing annex		$115,000
Hahn	22-0	Power check pad	69,700	
Do	60-34	Aircraft engineer, inspection and repair	31,700	
Do	21-0	Stub parking apron	175,000	
Lakenheath		Power check pad	50,000	
Do		Barrier, R/W	38,000	
Do		Aircraft ready shelter	175,000	
Do		Security fence	50,000	
Do	239-0	Storage, igloo		74,900
Do	241-0	do		74,900
Do	240-0	Shop, ordnance equipment		122,400
Ramstein		Alert crew quarters	35,000	
Sculthorpe	5-0	Aircraft engineer, inspection and repair	49,400	
Do		Squadron operations	114,000	
Do		Wholesale, supplies and equipment	100,000	
Do		Alert crew quarters	80,000	

Fiscal year 1960 U.S. Air Force minor construction projects approved or in process— Continued

Base	PRN	Description	Approved	In process
Cigli	T-13-7-59	Ready crew building	$30,000	
Do	T-13-14-59	Messhall, alert crew	27,000	
Spangdahlem	37-42-0	Aircraft shelters (6)	150,000	
Do	37-0	Quarters, alert crew	40,000	
Do	12-0	Approach lighting	24,000	
Wheelus	8-0	GPE shop	49,900	
Do	6-0	Water demineralized	39,050	
Do	51-8	Shop, aircraft engineer I. & R	48,000	
Do	22-8	Shop, Armament and electronic	129,000	
Do	52-0	Electric primary power	118,750	
Subtotal			2,420,500	$387,200
		Major command approval projects	692,369	1,139,409
Command total			3,112,869	1,526,600
U.S. AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE				
Karamursel	100-0	Trailer park		$178,400
Hoff	3-8	Operations building	$28,500	
Samsun	2-9	Laundry-dry cleaning facility		75,000
Site 9	9-30-60	Wells and pumphouse		135,000
Subtotal			28,500	388,400
		Major command approval projects	37,400	161,400
Command total			65,900	549,800

RECAPITULATION

Total projects approved or in process	$21,007,907
Fiscal year 1959 minor construction appropriation carryover	2,388,270
Fiscal year 1960 minor construction appropriation	14,500,000
Total funds available, fiscal year 1960	16,888,270

Mr. SHEPPARD. What have been your obligations for this work in each of the last 5 years?

Mr. SUFIT. We received approval for minor construction in the military construction appropriation in 1956. The obligations in 1956 were $18,276,000. In 1957 they were $19,790,000. In 1958 they were $16,986,000. In 1959 it is $16,879,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you estimate for 1960?

Mr. SUFIT. $15 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What justifies the increase in the sum of $3 million?

Mr. SUFIT. Over the years our requirements for minor construction as a base becomes firm have increased. We can meet changing situations through this program. As the bases are solidified and the major construction program has concluded we feel we can meet these changing situations through these efforts, and we anticipate we will have a greater opportunity to use these funds in this particular manner without major construction programs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is your limitation in these funds projectwise?

Mr. SUFIT. Limitations are established by law. They were codified in 10 U.S.C. 2674. The maximum is $200,000. We require Secretary of Defense approval from $50,000 to $200,000. We require Secretary of the Air Force approval from $25,000 to $50,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Once you have obtained approval in the categories you have referred to let me ask General Minton this question: What supervision do you have over the $200,000?

General MINTON. We have a pretty close supervision. We handle this exactly in the same manner as we handle our other major military construction items. It is processed by a panel in our headquarters and the selection of the AE design is exactly the same as for other items.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record at this time the obligations in this access roads account for the past 2 years and the roads constructed in fiscal 1960. What is the basis for your cost estimates for fiscal year 1961 in this field?

(The information requested is as follows:)

Obligations

	Thousands
Fiscal year 1958	$5,638
Fiscal year 1959	3,923
Fiscal year 1960 (actual through February)	3,389

Colonel EDMONDS. Of this total amount we have an estimate of $5.5 million for access road improvement in connection with the MINUTEMAN sites. I believe you will recall we testified the other day it would require access roads money through the Bureau of Public Roads for improvement of public roads while the other portion of the road is in the regular program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I remember that and the fact you referred to it also as something coming up later. That is why we deal with it now.

Colonel EDMONDS. Then we have eight TITAN sites to go, four in this program and four to follow in 1962 in order to complete the TITAN program. That is estimated at $1 million each. That is a total of $13.5 million, then, pertaining to the missile program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to answer any questions we might have on the floor, what is the relationship, if any, between the funding of your access roads requirements as presented here and the access roads requirements under the jurisdiction of the public works administration? What is the connection and what is the story on this?

Colonel EDMONDS. I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I am not familiar with the road program in the public works administration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I refer to the Bureau of Public Roads, of course.

Colonel EDMONDS. These access roads will be funded and constructed through the Bureau of Public Roads as required by law.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is the military contribution?

Colonel EDMONDS. Yes, sir; the military contribution for this effort.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as construction is concerned it will not fall within your category except so far as the presentation is concerned. Is that right?

General MINTON. That is right. The Bureau of Public Roads do their own design and supervision.

Mr. SHEPPARD. List for the record the roads contemplated in fiscal 1961 geographically.

Colonel EDMONDS. All right, sir.

I covered $13.5 million of the request, which totals $18.5 million. The other $5 million will be applied to selected projects, and I have a list of those projects which I will insert in the record.

(The list referred to follows:)

Department: USAF.
Base being supported by the access road project: Ballistic missile sites (location to be determined).
Length in miles: LS.
Estimated cost: $13,500,000.

It is proposed that the balance of the funds in the Air Force access roads program, $5 million, will be applied to selected projects from the following list:

1. Vandenberg AFB, $3,350,000

(*a*) Construct land-climbing lanes between Santa Maria and the base on Lompoc-Casmalia Road.

(*b*) Improve State Highway 1 from Orcutt to Harris Junction and along San Antonio Creek Road to 2 miles north of main gate, to intercept a proposed new road to increase capacity of Route 1 and San Antonio Creek Road from 350 to 600 vehicles per hour.

2. New Boston tracking and data acquisition station, New Hampshire, $300,000

(*a*) The existing New Boston Road is deficient in width, surface, capacity, and sight distances on grades and curves. Cannot now handle anticipated traffic safely and speedily. The final approach to the tracking station is only a one-lane, unpaved trail.

(*b*) It is recommended that New Boston Road be improved to provide at least an 18-foot width, preferably 20-foot, for the full route to the tracking station, with adequate all-weather shoulders, asphaltic concrete surface designed for anticipated traffic and loads, and minimum acceptable sight distances at all grades and curves.

3. Wright-Patterson AFB, Dayton, Ohio, $28,000

Access from State Route 235 to SAC area without passing through Patterson Field industrial area.

4. Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass., $271,000

There is much congestion: Old Bedford Road to the west is in poor condition. Marret Street is overburdened and is only good approach to main gate for access from the west, where 40 percent of personnel live.

5. Lincoln AFB, $1,100,000

For replacing a section of U.S. Highway 34 to accommodate for airway clearance, Highway 34 to extend easterly and southeasterly to interstate Routes 1 and 4, and approximate distance of 3.5 miles. New entrance road from Highway 34 to north gate.

6. Vance AFB, Enid, Okla., $74,000

(*a*) 3,450 lineal feet of 30-foot road.

(*b*) Acquisition of 8.30 acres.

(*c*) Entrance road relocated to divert traffic away from Capehart housing and elementary school. Present entrance road separates two areas of family housing.

7. Luke AFB, Phoenix, Ariz., $336,000

Replacement of a county road which runs through the base with a road off base and 1 mile east.

8. Dow AFB, Maine, $600,000

This project consists of rehabilitating and improving approximately 5 miles of road from Dow AFB to the Capehart housing area. The requirement is generated by the traffic between the base and the housing area by both military personnel and their dependents.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions pertaining to this item, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. A year ago we asked you to what extent you had checked with the State and Federal authorities in an effort to get them to as-

sume part of the cost of access roads. Will you give us a report on what has transpired in that field since the question was brought up a year ago?

General MINTON. I do not know of any specific inquiry of the Bureau of Public Roads for the entire program. In many individual cases we have gone to the Bureau of Public Roads. I can think of one we had recently for $2 million in Brigham City in connection with the MINUTEMAN site in an effort to get them to take a more active part. So far we have been unsuccessful beyond the clear line of demarcation which has been set forth.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that not more or less because of the manner in which the Division of Public Roads has allocations for their expenditures cleared through the State public roads divisions?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, as I understand it there are certain geographical areas which become preferential. Here in many cases you deviate from that.

General MINTON. That is correct. In each case that I know of they have a budget just as we have a budget and they have not included this requirement in it.

Mr. SIKES. There are instances where the local economy benefits as much from an access road as the Air Force. In such cases we feel there should be participation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it should be the policy of this committee to require that efforts be made to explore the possibilities in each case where access roads must be built, the possibility of securing participation by the Bureau of Public Roads or the local economy.

Colonel EDMONDS. I believe that provision is adequately covered in our procedures now, Mr. Sikes. Each access road must be certified for the Secretary of Defense by the Chief of Transportation. When they review those projects they go over them in detail as to the responsibility of funding.

There are some projects where we have State or other road participation in the funding where it can be definitely shown that it is their responsibility to fund a portion of the project.

Mr. SIKES. Which instances in the current budget involve participation?

Colonel EDMONDS. I am not aware of the breakout of participation in connection with these roads, but I believe that most all of these are 100 percent requirement of the Air Force.

Mr. SIKES. What kinds of roads are required at Lincoln Air Force Base where $1,100,000 is programed for access roads?

Colonel EDMONDS. I have only a very brief résumé of the Lincoln requirement. This road must be relocated because the airlanes pass so low over the road so as to make it extremely hazardous. It is due to this severance and it is for Route 34 into Route 1.

Mr. SIKES. Is the Vandenberg Air Force Base access road requirement all new?

Colonel EDMONDS. I don't know whether I understand what you mean by new.

Mr. SIKES. Is the $3,350,000 for relocation of roads or is it a new requirement for access roads?

Colonel EDMONDS. Primarily relocation. It covers the Casmalia-Lompoc Road and Route 1 from Orcutt to the Harris Junction. Perhaps Mr. Gibbens has more detailed knowledge of that requirement.

Mr. SIKES. Who benefits from these roads other than the Air Force itself?

Mr. GIBBENS. On this particular road, Mr. Sikes, the Casmalia-Lompoc Road is the established road at the present time which does run down through the reservation at Vandenberg. All the north-south traffic goes through there.

The improvement to Route 1 is west of the base and would allow a through route that would let the major portion of the travel that is not directed to the base be diverted completely off the base.

Mr. SIKES. It would occur to me that is for the benefit of the public as well as the Air Force and that other agencies should participate in this construction.

Mr. GIBBENS. I think here the feeling would be that the current road is sufficiently good for all the travel with certain improvements we are also planning to make, but that it is to the advantage of the Air Force to get all the nonessential traffic from running through the base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The situation which actually exists there is predicated on the following: You have your roads established, the standard roads requirements.

Then the base has added to the load factor. There is no question about that. I understand it runs about 18 to 25 percent over and above normal use.

Because of congestion in certain peak periods of the day, wherein the Air Force and all other contributing interests there throw a tremendous load in that area, that load causes a congested situation along with what is commonly known as the bypass areas going both north and south.

Mr. SIKES. Which would indicate to me that the local economy has a requirement for this additional road as well as the Air Force and it should participate in its construction.

I request, Mr. Chairman, we have more specific information as to what efforts the Air Force has made along this line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think we should.

In your access roads many conditions are involved in various counties in which the county has its financing responsibility for access roads which they themselves determine are necessary to take care of the local situation.

Let us say there are 50 road requirements within a coming fiscal year within a certain county. They will finance perhaps only 10 of them in this year's budget.

You people coming along, and while this may in respect contribute to the county or State, the question is how closely have you checked on the local and county levels to find out whether or not any part of our access roads are in their funding program. It seems to me that would be very important.

Let us use a figure of 10 as an example. Out of 10 you might find 2 or possibly more which were already in their funding requirements. If that is true then you are obviously entitled to participation.

Over and above that it would be controlled by the budgets of the counties and the States so far as the State interests are concerned. That is a pretty general condition, is it not?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This might influence the appropriation requirements.

General MINTON. We will check that for you, sir, and supply you the information.

(The information requested follows:)

The access road projects financed under the fiscal year 1960 military construction program appropriation for "Access roads" consisted of five projects as follows: Duluth MAP, Kincheloe AFB, Offutt AFB, A. C. & W. site P–42 near Lake City, Tenn., and Griffiss AFB.

Each of these projects was carefully investigated and all the projects except Griffiss AFB were determined to be wholly U.S. Air Force generated requirements. In the case of Griffiss AFB, the city of Rome, N.Y., participated in the amount of $60,000 which was the cost of purchasing the right-of-way for the access road project for that base.

The Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) has the responsibility for negotiating with the local governments as to the extent of local participation.

BPR has not yet started any of its road investigational studies nor has it started negotiations with the local governments for any of the roads in the fiscal year 1961 program. This is due to the fact that BPR does not investigate or negotiate until after it is assured that funds for the specific road will be available.

In the case of Vandenberg AFB, the local government has taken the position that the responsibility for road improvement rests with the Federal Government. A firm conclusion cannot be reached in this matter as BPR has not completed its investigations and negotiations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. With respect to this specific program, the $18.5 million. What part of the total cost of the access roads will that be? Is that the total cost of the roads you have in the program without any local participation in a single one of them?

Colonel EDMONDS. This is the total cost to us. If there is a contribution by any local or other public works highway fund it would be in addition to this that we have here. This is our total requirement only.

Mr. JONAS. I do not understand. Will the $18.5 million complete the requirement for the access roads for the TITAN sites, the MINUTEMAN sites, and the miscellaneous sites?

Colonel EDMONDS. We estimate that it will.

Mr. JONAS. Without any local contribution? This will build the access roads?

Colonel EDMONDS. In the case of the MINUTEMAN I think we can definitely state that in that case it will be a requirement purely of the Air Force because we will have to either strengthen, widen, or——

Mr. JONAS. I want to clear up the matter of money. Within the present program do you have any agreements or expect any local contributions on any of the access roads or is this $18.5 million the amount to take care of the total cost of the access roads in the 1961 program?

Colonel EDMONDS. I believe I stated before I do not know whether there is a local contribution in addition to the amounts we have here or not. We would have to check that.

General MINTON. This is in addition to anything that will be spent by the local subdivisions.

Mr. JONAS. How can you tell if you do not already know whether you will have a local contribution? How do you know whether or not this will be sufficient?

General MINTON. Because this on our part is our estimate of what it will take. There will be other contributions by——

Mr. JONAS. It is not an estimate of what the total cost will be but only an estimate of what your part of it will be?

General MINTON. That is correct. Any additional costs which are incurred by the local municipalities will be in addition to this.

As I said a while ago, we have clear lines of demarcation of what we can pay for and what we cannot.

For instance, this will pay for roads for MINUTEMAN sites of which we do not know the locations right now. I expect to know within a month or two. I cannot say offhand whether those roads will be a half mile long or a quarter mile long.

Mr. JONAS. Any contributions made, then, will not diminish this amount but will be in addition to it?

Colonel EDMONDS. That is correct.

General MINTON. This is just the maximum amount we estimate we will have to pay in accordance with the directives.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this a general condition having to do with these sites? Most of these sites are in a semiremoved or isolated condition.

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That means you are creating side roads. To me they resemble a local freight line as compared with a main line operation. The question is how much the localities are interested in the average access roads.

General MINTON. As a general rule it will be comparatively minor. Our problem this year is magnified over what it has been in the past. On the missile sites in the past, for instance, we have been interested in four or five sites, nine squads. With the MINUTEMAN, in that one organization alone we have ——— locations we have to work on.

As testified to yesterday, we will make every effort to locate these missiles right close to presently existing adequate roads. That is one of our criteria.

Mr. JONAS. I conclude from what you say, General, that there will then be no local contributions to the cost of any of the access roads in this program?

General MINTON. I did not intend to convey that. What I meant to convey was that this amount of money is our estimate of what we will have to contribute for these access roads. There will be other moneys that the local municipalities will supply. I do not know about that amount.

I am not certain that this amount we have specified here will be within 15 or 20 percent. I hope it will be lower than shown.

Mr. JONAS. If you have an amount which represents your best estimate of the total cost to the Air Force of building your requirement, it would seem to me that any local contributions would merely go to extending the access roads further than you contemplate or bring in more improvements.

General MINTON. I do not think they would extend the access roads. They might perhaps improve some of the access roads, where

there is a combination of increased traffic because we are hauling this ——— missile over in the case of the MINUTEMAN, plus increased traffic due to the people who live in the vicinity and working on the site.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

General MINTON. This is a difficult program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this not a fact: The average access road is not built to withstand that tonnage?

General MINTON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Most of them are standard black-top roads?

General MINTON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With the tonnage you have to haul here you have to have a heavier base for the road than you would ordinarily have within certain counties?

General MINTON. That is entirely true. You will recall the testimony of yesterday that the entire rig, including the missile, will be in the neighborhood of ——— pounds.

I know you have seen signs on rural roads of 8,000-pound load limits, 10,000-pound load limits, and so on. We have real problems.

Mr. LAIRD. What is the ballistic missile site problem here at Luke and Dow?

Colonel EDMONDS. They are not in connection with the ballistic missiles, Mr. Laird. Those are normal-type access roads.

Mr. LAIRD. Those are both old bases?

Colonel EDMONDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Is there some new requirement there?

General MINTON. I do not know.

Colonel EDMONDS. At Luke the only detail I have is that it is a base bypass. I assume from that it would keep traffic from going through a portion of the base.

In Dow it is an access project to the Capehart housing area and it is primarily rehabilitation, putting the road in a usable condition.

Mr. LAIRD. This is just within the normal Air Force program and has no connection with the missile program?

Colonel EDMONDS. That is right.

Mr. LAIRD. That is all.

LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert a tabulation which shows the projects for minor land acquisition in fiscal year 1960 and those in process at the present time.

(The information requested follows:)

Installation	Purpose	Acres fee	Cost fee	Acres easement	Cost easement
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr	ILS	2.30	2,100	1.05	
Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr	Approach lights	.82	200	6.70	700
Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex	Approach zone	18.62	2,090		
Beale Air Force Base, Calif	TITAN	60	18,060	30.30	6,000
Matagorda Air Force Base, Tex	Powerline	2.73	1,600		
Altus Air Force Base, Okla	Missile	33.33	14,000		
Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak.	Approach lights	.77	300	7.16	700
Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex	do	12.5	4,000		
Watertown Air Force Station, N.Y.	Sewer			1.65	500

Installation	Purpose	Acres fee	Cost fee	Acres easement	Cost easement
McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.	Approach zone	.01	25	20.55	2,050
Dyess Air Force Base, Tex.	Approach lights	10.06	1,025	10.33	775
Homestead Air Force Base, Fla.	do	15.04	23,700		
McCoy Air Force Base, Fla.	do	.30	260	2.99	510
Pease Air Force Base, N.H.	do	.79	900	4.35	1,400
Forbes Air Force Base, Kans.	do	.01	80	10.21	1,900
Shaw Air Force Base, S.C.	Tacan	.14	200	12.06	850
Stewart Air Force Base, N.Y.	Weather facility	1.8	2,100		
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio.	Approach lights			13.75	15,000
Otis Air Force Base, Mass.	do	50	3,000		
Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich.	Runway			69.73	19,000
*Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.	Hazard			3.22	3,650
Turner Air Force Base, Ga.	ILS	.009	700	1.50	300
Westover Air Force Base, Mass.	Beacon lights	.50	3,000	5.24	5,300
Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.	Search radar	.69	1	78.48	1,134
North Concord Air Force Station, Vt.	Access road			74.5	8,800
New Boston AFR, N.H.	Runway			90	4,000
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio.	Navigation aids	10.60	15,600	.35	300
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont.	ILS	3.71	1,965	7.59	750
Westover Comm Anx, Mass.	Access road			43.65	5,500
England Air Force Base, La.	ILS	3.95	4,185	14.2	2,160
Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex.	ILS	2.95	125	10.35	421
Lowry B&G range, Colo.	Access road	3.64	150		
Hamilton Air Force Base, Calif.	Approach lights	12.15	100		
Eufala Air Force Station, Ala.	Family housing	8	4,000	1.01	600
Cross City Air Force Station, Fla.	do	10.47	5,270	3.83	3,700
Thomasville Air Force Station, Ala.	do	7.42	17,600		
Altus Air Force Base, Okla.	Ceilometer			.12	270
Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind.	Middle marker	.49	2,000		
Cut Bank Air Force Station, Mont.	Trailer court	4.10	1,525		
Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.	Homing beacon	.69	470		
Hancock Field, N.Y.	Drainage			4.73	150
Stead Air Force Base, Nev.	Pipeline			.99	150
Dover Air Force Base, Del.	Approach lights	20	24,700		
Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii [1]	Pipeline right-of-way	7.62	19,450	1.43	1
Dover Air Force Base, Del.	Runway	20.97	7,270		
Andrews Air Force Base, Md.	Approach lights			23	22,000
England Air Force Base, La.	Alert hangar	103	7,925		
Clinton Sherman Air Force Okla.	ILS	2.30	900	13.33	2,070
Dyess Air Force Base, Tex.	Ceilometer	.48	100	1.43	300
Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.	Transition			26.60	3,050
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio.	Ceilometer	.25	300		
Olmstead Air Force Base, Penn	Flood protection	42.75	42.75		
Cutbank Air Force Station, Mont.	Sewage facility	4.10	1,525		
Neklason Lake Air Force Station, Alaska.[1]	White Alice			38.85	1,780
Soldotna Air Force Station, Alaska.	do			43.31	1,510
McCoy Air Force Base, Fla.	Railroad spur			.90	2,000
Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.[1]	Weapons calibration	8.19	3,000		
Williams Air Force Base, Ariz.	Flood control	80	2,000		
Suffolk County Air Force Base, N.Y.[1]	Ceilometer	.19	400	.78	1,200
Scott Air Force Base, Ill.[1]	Obstacle			64.5	4,000
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio.[1]	Approach zone			43.53	3,000
Larson Air Force Base, Wash.[1]	Access road	.46	500		

[1] Planned for balance fiscal year 1960.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What have been your obligations for this work in each of the last 5 years?

Mr. SUFIT. The land acquisition program began in 1957. In that year we had $2,000. In 1958 it was $10,000. In 1959 it was $86,000. Actual obligations in fiscal year 1960 through March 31, 1960, total $247,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your request for $400,000 this year should be explained because of the difference in the figures you have just given. What is the explanation for the increase?

Mr. GIBBENS. I do not have the figures by fiscal years, but I do show in calendar 1957, $20,000, and in calendar 1958, $36,000. In calendar 1959 we ran up to $842,000.

It is quite likely that these are the totals of our real estate directives to the field rather than the fiscal obligations that Mr. Sufit has given.

The big increase in calendar 1959 is due to the raising of the limitation from $5,000 to $25,000 per parcel.

In calendar 1959, this $842,000 would have covered about 1,700 acres in fee and about 1,400 acres of easement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When the record comes down, if you have anything further clarifying the issue, please insert it in the record.

(Information requested follows:)

The fiscal year 1960 appropriation/allocation of $300,000 has not been quite sufficient and, based on requirements already known for fiscal year 1961, it is estimated that $400,000 will be required for minor land acquisitions during fiscal year 1961.

LAND LEASE, OKINAWA

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have discussed this problem with reference to land lease on Okinawa with the Army and with the Navy. What do you estimate the total Air Force obligation under this program to be, gentlemen?

Mr. GIBBENS. Do you mean future obligations?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. GIBBENS. That would be very hard to determine or estimate, Mr. Chairman. As of fiscal year 1960, the determination was made for 10-year advance payments if the owner so desired. In 1961, then, we would pay them an advance. Any payments in advance over 5 years would come out of the military construction program. Anything less than that would be out of the O. & M. fund. The landowner may take the option to get either advance payments or to continue annual payments in each year. So it is hard to tell which payment will come out of which account in any succeeding year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because of that agreement, you naturally have a fluctuating condition and it is difficult to evaluate it at this time. Is that right?

Mr. GIBBENS. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the Air Force obligations in the maintenance and operation account for this same purpose?

Mr. GIBBENS. During the last year? That has been the subject of two reappraisals in the last several years. We originally started out in the first payments of around $432,000 a year. It was reappraised in fiscal 1956 and our annual payments went to $1.3 million. In 1959 and 1960, it was later reappraised and our estimated O. & M. account for 1960 was about $1.9 million. We feel that might be a little high as an estimate. It might be closer to $1½ million. These are only annual payments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record the specific projects involved in this appropriation when the record comes down to you.

(The information requested follows:)

	Units	Total
Beale	230	$250,700
Brooks	170	185,200
Griffiss	135	207,200
Offutt	500	649,100
Turner	430	514,300
Westover	180	196,100
Total	1,645	2,002,600

NOTE.—These funds are required for: Title I and II A–E services, FHA appraisal fees, and land and supporting utilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you made any provision in this program for the construction of community facilities with mortgage proceeds?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir; we have not.

STATUS OF CAPEHART HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking, what is the present status of the Air Force Capehart housing program?

Colonel GODDARD. Generally speaking, the program is about two-thirds complete; 50,000 units out of 60,000 are either completed or under construction. As a breakdown on that approximately 37,000 are complete; approximately 13,000 are under construction. Another 10,000 units are in various stages of design, bidding, or closing. As an overall, I would say we are, from the design standpoint, about 95 to 98 percent complete. From the construction point of view we are about 66 percent complete.

Mr. SHEPPARD. General Minton, may I ask you this question: What is your personal experience and observation having to do with the general construction program of Capehart housing insofar as problems emanating originally from improper A. & E. work, change orders, et cetera? I am asking about how many headaches and what are the characteristics of said headaches?

General MINTON. Early in the program we had a considerable number of problems, but for the past 2 years we have made a practice of site adaptation and design for Capehart housing, depending upon the climate for which the housing was being developed. Over the period of years we have developed some pretty sound designs and, after building the houses and testing them for several years, we have been able to work out most of the bugs. I think now our change orders, bad design items, and things of that sort, which caused us trouble previously are very low now, just because of the fact that we are merely building houses that we have built before, with very minor changes in architectural treatment, painting, and so forth. Of course we get a much better project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are these operations handled by you or the Corps of Engineers?

General MINTON. In the Capehart program, Mr. Chairman, we handle that ourselves.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You handle that exclusively?

General MINTON. We handle it completely with architect and engineering firms on the title I and title II work.

PROGRESS PAYMENTS ON CAPEHART HOUSING STRUCTURES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under those circumstances, I am prompted to ask another question. Who is in control of your progress payments to the contractors on the Capehart housing structures?

Colonel GODDARD. Mr. Chairman, the contracting officer must certify the payment monthly, and then that goes on to the mortgagee for approval. So effectively, our contracting officer is in control of the monthly payments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know at this time how many deferred payments of that category may exist? I am talking about the progress payments, not the final payment.

Colonel GODDARD. No, sir.

General MINTON. Some are being held up.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the procedure which is followed in the holding up of progress payments, what is the percentage which you feel are justified to be withheld from a contractor as against protecting yourself in the funds which are necessary for the final payments?

General MINTON. Let me answer it, and then Colonel Goddard can add to it. That is a real fine question. It must be a matter of judgment on the part of the architect and engineer who is supervising the work there. We must have his recommendation. The base engineer is responsible for it. I like to have his recommendation. The contracting officer has the final authority, with of course supervision from higher level, to make the payment. There may be circumstances which make it necessary for us to be a little more strict than we would be otherwise. So you must have the element of judgment in that.

To be perfectly frank, we have some contractors in this business that we are a little tighter with than other contractors. If a man has a reputation of building two or three projects for us and doing a very fine job, getting good results at a low price, and on the next project he has a little bad luck along the line, not affecting the quality of the housing or the cost, we take that into consideration. On the other hand, if some contractor has tried to beat us down on two or three projects, we watch him a little closer.

Colonel GODDARD. I might add to that, Mr. Chairman, that the housing contract under which we operate specifically precludes the contracting officer from certifying for payment any work that is not properly installed or any materials not properly stored. We sometimes get into a difference of opinion on whether or not the work is meeting the plans and specifications. So, to answer your question, the withholdings are predominantly in the area of protecting the Government for improperly installed or incompletely installed work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Contractor X is constructing housing, and those who are in charge of inspecting that operation at the moment I presume realize any discrepancies or deviations from the requirements. How cumulative can that be and still keep a contractor on the job? That, to me, is the crux of the whole thing. In other words, how far will we let him continue with his mistakes? Is it up until it is a million or a million and a quarter dollars?

Colonel GODDARD. Mr. Chairman, we have a procedure inherent in the contract document called a default procedure. It is a little different from the normal appropriated fund work because in this instance we do not control the money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Colonel GODDARD. As you realize, the money is provided by private enterprise. So the man who is putting the money out is really the big wheel in this default procedure. If he feels his money is going into a bad investment, under the building and loan agreement which he has with the builder he can invoke default and bring in the bonding company or surety to perform. When we feel that the contractor is not amenable to good contractor discipline, we would ask the moneylender, the mortgagee, to invoke the default technique.

So far in the Capehart program, in over 100 projects, the Air Force has not had to do that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While it is true that the moneylender in this instance is a private institution, it is my understanding—I may be in error about this—that the military is actually in charge of the construction supervision, to see that it is turned out in accordance with the contract.

Colonel GODDARD. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So the military is literally protecting the lending agency here by its own ability to scrutinize these issues and not let them get out of control.

Colonel GODDARD. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you cannot come to a harmonious understanding with the contractor, then of course you have the redress of notifying the financial agency and asking them to step in, but the primary obligation for compliance with the contract is vested in the military.

Colonel GODDARD. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. I go right back to the question as to how cumulative do you permit this responsibility to pile up?

Colonel GODDARD. We permit it only to the extent that we feel we are bogged down. Some time ago we had a project where we were very near to the breaking point, but we never got there. This is a matter of degree, Mr. Chairman. Many times it will take people from this headquarters and the major commands to come into the problem and talk to the president of the bank concerned or to the Federal Housing Administration director or other principals to bring pressure to bear to resolve the problem. So far we have not had to bog down one of our projects.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where there is a difficulty of this character, am I right in assuming that a contractor has the right to protect himself to this degree? If he is in conflict with the officer in charge, he has a right to carry his case to a higher authority within the Air Force

itself. Do you or do you not have an appeal board within the Air Force?

Colonel GODDARD. We do, Mr. Chairman. It is called the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, of which there is an Air Force panel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. He has literally three steps of redress here, if he wishes to exercise it, is that right?

Colonel GODDARD. Any time he does not agree with a determination in fact by the contracting officer, he may appeal that decision to this higher authority in the Air Force.

WHERRY HOUSING REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the general condition pertaining to the Wherry projects which you have already procured and are rehabilitating, et cetera? What is the general picture in that field, please?

Colonel GODDARD. Sir, we have acquired slightly over 37,000 units, nearly all our units except 3. We have funded and have underway construction for a little over 50 percent out of a total of about $90 million, speaking in round numbers. We have to fund in the Department of Defense about $50 million to $55 million. We are in process. We have finished two or three projects at Chanute, Patrick, and Eglin. The work is all done. At several others, 15 or 20 others, the work is either underway or shortly will get underway, bids having been received and contracts just awarded.

(Additional information was supplied as follows:)

WHERRY HOUSING REPAIR AND PROGRAM

The total dollar requirement of the Department of Air Force Wherry housing repair and improvement program is $100 million. To date the Air Force has been allocated approximately $54 million to rehabilitate and improve 20,812 units at 29 locations leaving an unfunded requirement of $46 million for 16,400 units at 28 locations. This includes the 300 unit section 207 housing at Turner AFB, Ga.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to pay this compliment to you people. I have been on many of your stations. Particularly where you are going into modification of the Wherry projects, those I saw, with the exception of one, were doing a very good job. One of them I thought was a little offside, but that will be corrected before the contract is terminated.

WHERRY HOUSING PROCUREMENT

What is the total of Wherry housing projects that you people have procured, if you can recall, and out of that total amount, what is the number that you had to go to condemnation with because you could not agree with the operator of the project?

Colonel GODDARD. Mr. Sheppard, if I may, I would like to be very general and then provide a tabulation for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you will, please.

Colonel GODDARD. Speaking from memory only, we have gone to condemnation in only about one-fourth or less of the number. I can provide the exact number and the bases. We have settled most of our acquisitions through negotiation under the formula price established by the Congress.

I might say that the Air Force policy in this matter is to bend every effort to negotiate, and to go to condemnation only where it is mandatory under the law in order to carry out the law.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can understand if you have an operator who is completely unreasonable there is nothing you can do, because you have a formula of procedure which to me creates a ceiling. I want to compliment the Air Force as compared with your sister services in this operation. By pursuing a very close adherence to the formula established by the Congress, you have avoided a tremendous amount, percentagewise, of condemnation proceedings.

I think it rather interesting, gentlemen, when you notice that of those condemnation proceedings which have already been through the courts, some of them, of course, on appeal, in 76 percent of the cases the courts have granted a great deal more money to the operator than the formula would have provided. It would appear to me from the point of the taxpayers' interest in this situation, and the record of the courts as those records presently reveal, whenever you can settle a case within close proximity to the formula, it is a very intelligent business thing to do. I wish the other services would follow that procedure. We would all have been better off. If we wind up in some of these court procedures, somebody will have an awful headache.

Colonel GODDARD. Thank you very much.

(The information requested follows:)

WHERRY HOUSING ACQUISITION PROGRAM

The Department of the Air Force Wherry housing acquisition program consists of 37,412 units in 63 projects at 57 locations. To date, a total of 33,134 units in 57 projects have been acquired, 11 projects of which were acquired through condemnation proceedings. In addition, two projects (Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 250 units and 300 units of section 207 housing at Turner Air Force Base, Ga.) have recently been negotiated and are scheduled for acquisition on May 1, 1960. Four projects consisting of 3,728 units remain unacquired.

List of Wherry housing acquired by condemnation

	Number of units		*Number of units*
Biggs, Tex	800	Malstrom, Mont	400
Chanute, Ill	800	Patrick, Fla	680
Fairchild, Wash	1,000	Selfridge, Mich	511
Hamilton, Calif	505	Sewart, Tenn	600
Larson, Wash	800	Travis, Calif	980
McDill, Fla	800		

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on any of the items discussed?

EXPERIENCE WITH HEAT PUMPS

Mr. JONAS. What is your current experience with heat pumps?

General MINTON. We have about 8,000 of them installed. I think we have gone much further along the line in the installation of heat pumps than the other services have. My personal opinion is that we have installed enough of them to give ourselves a really good test on the feasibility for the continued use of the heat pump.

I am concerned, Mr. Jonas, with one point in connection with heat pumps, and that is the long-range maintenance and operation of heat pumps. We are getting some very fine bids now for the immediate maintenance of heat pumps, $35 or $40 a season, but these units are

brandnew. I would like to know what we shall have to pay for maintenance when the units are 6 or 7 or 8 years old. It is not a settled issue. We have gone very carefully into the installation of heat pumps.

Mr. JONAS. You still accept heat pumps and still use them?

General MINTON. In very few cases. It has to be a special consideration. I feel that we have enough of them installed. I do not want to go overboard and have 20,000 or 30,000 units installed and, over a period of 2 or 3 years, start developing troubles with them.

Mr. JONAS. What is your experience with the ones which have been installed?

General MINTON. It depends upon the manufacturer of them. We have two or three installations that I do not like at all, myself, and we have quite a few installations which are very good. I think in our initial installations of them we got perhaps a bad manufacturer or perhaps we drew up some bad specifications for them. We have had the Bureau of Standards working with us and the industry working with us to be certain that we get better standards and better invitations for bids. It is pretty hard to draw, except across the company line, a generalization on that.

Mr. JONAS. No other questions.

REPROGRAMING REQUESTS

Mr. SIKES. We are ready to take up the additional requests which have been submitted by the Air Force under the fiscal year 1961 military construction appropriation program. We will insert the summary sheet at this point.

(The summary sheets follow:)

Base	Item	Scope	Amount (thousands)	Page No.
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES				
Air Defense Command:				
Duluth MAP	Open mess, NCO	3,000 square feet	110	1
Grand Forks	Auto storage, shed	19,500 square feet	136	2
	Installation engineer administration.	2,134 square feet	72	3
	Installation engineer, storage, covered.	9,160 square feet	104	4
	Installation engineer storage, shed.	9,450 square feet	64	5
Minot	Auto storage, shed	19,500 square feet	157	6
Otis	Communications, base	7,432 square feet	311	7
Air Material Command:				
Brookley	Open storage, depot	11,000 quare yards.	88	8
	Water supply treatment	2,246 TD	112	9
Kelly	Liquid fuel defuel, aircraft overhaul.	1 HY	355	10
Air Research and Development Command:				
Edwards	Chapel annex	3,800 square feet	86	11
Eglin	Washrack, aircraft	4,540 square yards	138	12
Patrick	Steam heat mains	1,200 feet	48	13
Cape Canaveral	Fence, security	6,000 feet	91	14
Strategic Air Command:				
Bergstrom	Installation engineer administration.	4,400 square feet	108	15
Blytheville	Auto maintenance administration.	3,010 square feet	65	16
Bunker Hill	do	3,010 square feet	67	17
	Storage, ground-powered equipment.	5,640 square feet	51	18

Base	Item	Scope	Amount (thousands)	Page No.
Strategic Air Command—Con.				
Castle	Shop, aircraft maintenance organization.	4,160 square feet	82	19
Clinton-Sherman	Shop, armature and electronics base.	2,542 square feet	84	20
Dow	Shop, parachute and dinghy	2,500 square feet	77	21
Larson	Fence, security	8,600 feet	38	22
Turner	Installation engineer pavement and ground facilities.	4,452 square feet	73	23
Tactical Air Command:				
George	Shelter, aircraft weapons calibration.	1920 square feet	50	24
	Shop, armature and electronic base.	12,650 square feet	309	25
Luke	Communications, base	4,587 square feet	176	26
Aircraft control and warning system: Cape Charles.	Auto maintenance shop	1,485 square feet	51	27
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES				
Pacific air forces:				
Kadena	Headquarters Group, Air Force Security Service.	10,000 square feet	205	28
	Utility line ducts	45,235 feet	221	29
Okino Erabu Shima	Laundry, base	1,000 square feet	24	30
	Water supply	60 TD	68	31
Strategic Air Command:				
Andersen	Water supply facility	2,000 TD	800	32
Ernest Harmon	Water supply	LS	84	33
Sondrestrom	Shop refueling vehicle	2,246 square feet	242	34
U.S. Air Forces in Europe:				
Incirlik	Fire station, combination	9,298 square feet	160	35
	Installation engineer maintenance shop.	10,000 square feet	149	36
	Headquarters group, airbase.	14,720 square feet	218	37
	Recreation, library	2,496 square feet	56	38
Lakenheath	Hospital	115 bed	3,265	39
I-5	Family housing	133 units	2,355	41
	School, dependents	5,530 square feet	123	42
	Commissary	3,500 square feet	62	43
Aircraft control and warning system: Pinetree.	Radar improvement	LS	2,000	44
Various worldwide:				
Various locations	Shell housing modification	712/356 FA	1,621	45
Ballistic missiles		LS	21,000	47

NOTE.—Congressional authorization for the above items is being requested in the fiscal year 1961 authorization bill.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. SIKES. Colonel Parkhill, I think it would be sufficient for our purposes if you will go through this listing and tell us what is involved briefly now for the purposes of the committee and then submit additional justification in each case. Will you go down the list and do that?

Colonel PARKHILL. All right, Mr. Chairman.

This total program adds up to $35,756,000. It covers, of course, a variety of items on quite a number of bases. I propose to indicate the minor items in summary form.

For Air Defense Command, we have seven items on four bases totaling $954,000.

Mr. SIKES. Will you identify those bases?

Colonel PARKHILL. All right, sir. Duluth, an open mess, NCO. This would be an addition to the existing facility. We have about half the requirement here. We proposed to furnish the other half.

Mr. SIKES. And the cost in each instance?

Colonel PARKHILL. That would be $110,000.

For Grand Forks we have an auto storage shed for $136,000; this is for unheated storage of base vehicles. They have nothing existing

at the present time. For administration, installation engineer, $72,000. This would be an addition, as we are increasing this base to take care of the new SAC bomber mission added to the fighter mission. IE storage, covered, $104,000, again an addition, due to the increased mission. Storage shed for $64,000, another addition due to the increased mission.

At Minot, we are also proposing an auto storage shed for $157,000. This would provide unheated storage for the base vehicles.

The same mission situation prevails as at Grand Forks.

At Otis, a base communications building, $311,000. This would replace existing widely separated inadequate facilities.

For Air Materiel Command, the first base is Brookley. We have an open storage depot. This would provide paved outside storage for supplies.

For Brookley, a water-treatment plant. This is for $112,000. This is to improve the existing plant. The mechanical system is deteriorated and the quality of water is such that we need this work. For Kelly Air Force Base, an Air Materiel Command depot, we are proposing a liquid fuel and defuel for aircraft. This consists of tankage and pumps and would provide for the rapid fueling and defueling of the heavy bomber aircraft that are going through major overhaul. The cost here would be $355,000.

For the Air Research and Development Command, we have at the first base, Edwards, a chapel annex, $86,000. This is a deficiency.

For Eglin, a washrack for the heavy bomber mission that is going in that base, $138,000.

For Patrick, we propose to extend certain steam heat mains for $48,000 to some buildings that have existing deteriorated heating plants.

Cape Canaveral, security fence, for $91,000. We have purchased land to the north of the launch area and we propose to put a new fence in for security reasons.

For the Strategic Air Command, at Bergstrom Air Force Base, we have an installation engineer, administration. This would be a replacement of some tarpaper temporary type buildings.

For Blytheville, an auto maintenance administration for $65,000. This is a deficiency replacement. They are presently using winterized tents and small prefabs. For Bunker Hill, an auto maintenance administration for $67,000. This would be an addition. For storage, ground-powered equipment, $51,000. They have nothing existing. At Castle, we are proposing a shop, aircraft maintenance organization for $82,000. This will be to support the fighter-interceptor squadron. At Clinton-Sherman, a shop, armanent and electronics base, will be an addition to the existing shop for $84,000. This is generated by additional maintenance requirements brought about by the modifications of the B–52's.

At Dow Air Force Base, an addition to the shop, parachute and dinghy shop, for $77,000.

At Larson, fence, security. This would be to provide a fence around the B–52 restricted parking apron for $38,000.

For Turner Air Force Base, we have an installations engineer pavement and ground facility. This will be to replace the existing substandard widely dispersed temporary buildings that will be destroyed.

For Tactical Air Command, at George Air Force Base, we are pro-

posing a shelter aircraft weapons calibration for $50,000. This is a repetitive type item that we discussed the first day of the hearings and is for the fighter-interceptor unit; also a shop armament and electronics base, $309,000, required in support of the fighter-interceptor squadron.

At Luke, a base communications building for $176,000. This will replace space in the headquarters building that is too small for the requirement and cannot be expanded.

For aircraft control and warning, we are proposing an auto maintenance shop for Cape Charles. They are presently using a small amount of space in the recreational workshop. Other than that, they have no space to maintain their 22 vehicles.

Outside the United States, for Pacific Air Forces, at Kadena, we have the first item, a headquarters group for the security service, $205,000. This will provide administrative space for that security service operational unit that will be moved over from Japan.

The utility line ducts at Kadena are to replace the existing underground electrical distribution system which is badly deteriorated.

At Okino Erabu Shima, two items: first, a laundry base for $24,000. This will be to provide a small building to install an available field type laundry unit. They are presently using barrack space. The water supply is $68,000. That will be to provide a new well and pump line, the present well does not provide the required amount of water.

For the Strategic Air Command, we have at Andersen a water supply facility, $800,000. This is to provide for a new treatment plant, the calcium content of the water being such that it is badly deteriorating the existing water distribution system.

At Ernest Harmon, for the water supply system, an item for $84,000, will be to develop a new source. The present source is contaminated. At Sondrestrom, a shop refueling vehicle, $242,000. They have nothing existing. This will be to maintain their refueling tank trailers.

The U.S. Air Forces in Europe, the first base is Incirlik, a fire station, combination. This would replace existing scattered buildings and provide a consolidated five-stall crash station with three-stall structural station to provide for all the equipment and the messing and housing of crews at $160,000.

IE maintenance shop for $149,000; this would be to satisfy a deficiency. They presently have about half of the total requirement.

Headquarters group, airbase; this again is to satisfy a deficiency. There is also a item for recreation library for $56,000. This is also a deficiency.

At Lakenheath, we propose a hospital for $3,265,000. At I–5, family housing, 133 units, $2,355,000, and also a dependents' school for $123,000 and a commissary for $62,000.

LAKENHEATH HOSPITAL

Mr. SIKES. While you are on Lakenheath, you list a requirement for a hospital at $3,265,000. Tell us more about the necessity for this hospital. What hospital facilities are there now?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Sir, this is the area-type hospital to replace Wimpole Park, which was a 125-bed hospital that we operated prior to the expiration of our lease. The hospital was located on Mrs. Bain-

bridge's estate. The lease expired on December 31, 1959. We were unable to extend the lease. Therefore, Wimpole Park did close.

Mr. SIKES. Was it desirable to extend the lease?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. It was most desirable from our point of view.

Mr. SIKES. What prevented extension of the lease?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Mrs. Bainbridge refused to extend the lease.

Mr. SIKES. Do you know her reason?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Well, sir; I can read a letter to you if you would like to hear it. It is short. This is a letter from Mrs. Bainbridge:

> There seems to be some uncertainty on the part of the authorities on the base as to the termination of the lease of the hospital site on the park here. I should like to make the situation quite clear. There is not, and never has been, any question of the lease being extended beyond December 31, 1959. The Air Ministry has never suggested any such thing.
>
> In any case, in no circumstances and not even for a day would I consider it. I hope this will put an end to this fantastic rumor that is going about and make it needless to discuss the question again.

After we received that letter, sir, we gathered that she was not going to extend the lease.

General CURTIN. If I might elaborate on that, sir, the extension of this lease had been the subject of considerable high-level interest in the Air Ministry and in Parliament in the United Kingdom. I believe on two occasions, at least one, the influence of the Air Ministry was used to get an extension of the lease through appeal to Mrs. Bainbridge's attorneys, et cetera. However, due to some incident, I presume, that we are not aware of, she finally just put her foot down and said, "You will go." That was it.

Mr. SIKES. Who built the hospital at Wimpole Park?

General CURTIN. This was actually the utilization of her family home, as I recall.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. It was on her ground, sir. It was a temporary structure. I do not know who built the original hospital. It was built during the war.

Mr. SIKES. How long had it been in use?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We had had it in use—I would have to check the exact dates, but we have used it up until 1959 and we have been using it all during 1948, 1949, and the 1950's, up until 1959.

Mr. SIKES. It is a temporary facility?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. As I remember, sir, it was a temporary facility built on her grounds.

Mr. SIKES. To whom does the facility revert?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. It was destroyed. It was removed and her grounds were restored.

General CURTIN. This is the ancestral home. We could not take the ambulances through the front gate because it was too narrow. When they did go through in a hurry they would nick off the bricks. She insisted they go around to the rear entrance to get on the estate.

Mr. SIKES. What was the number of beds available at Wimpole Park?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. 125 beds, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What will be the capacity of the new hospital?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. 115.

Mr. SIKES. Is this the actual anticipated requirement for beds in this hospital?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. What is the situation on two other hospitals that are mentioned in a letter to the chairman from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Berry? These hospitals are at South Ruislip and Burderop Park.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We have facilities at both of those. We are operating facilities at both of those locations, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Will you continue to do so?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes. They will continue in operation.

Mr. SIKES. Is there no other facility that can be used in lieu of the one which is proposed at Lakenheath?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. No, sir, not for that area. It serves the entire East Anglia area.

Mr. SIKES. What are you using now?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. At the present time when we saw the lease was going to expire, we modified an existing dispensary at Lakenheath. It was a 38-bed dispensary. We modified it, using every available building and put in a temporary hospital operation-type facility. It came out now we have approximately 64 beds, with a very makeshift arrangement for our surgery, X-ray, and that type.

One of the greatest drawbacks to our existing facilities, we have no OB capability at Lakenheath. We have to maintain that in Mildenhall, which is several miles removed. This means that we do not have surgery in immediate backup to our delivery capability, which from the practice of medicine standpoint is a very undersirable situation.

Mr. SIKES. When is the new hospital proposed to be available?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. It is currently under design, sir. We would hope to put it under contract this summer and I think a 2-year construction period is probably a fair estimate.

Mr. SIKES. You will use the temporary facilities in the meantime?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We will have to continue using it in the meantime, yes.

Mr. SIKES. What about the site? Is the site already selected?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir. There is a site for the facility.

Mr. SIKES. Do we have a lease on the site?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. It is on the Lakenheath property. I will have to ask someone else to help me out on the Lakenheath property, or Lakenheath Air Force Station.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any possibility of problem developing regarding the use of the new site?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The site would be under the same status as the rest of the base, sir.

General CURTIN. Under the jurisdiction of the Air Ministry, Mr. Chairman, and we would anticipate no problem. We know the design is well along on this.

Another point of interest, this requirement has been reviewed also with the Ministry of Health in the United Kingdom and they are very anxious that we provide this facility. They have accorded it, within the overall medical support in the area, a very, very high priority from their viewpoint.

Mr. SIKES. Will any people other than Air Force personnel have the right to use the hospital?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir. We would serve the Army personnel and also the U.S. civilians in the area, sir.

Mr. SIKES. No foreign personnel?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. No foreign personnel, no, sir.

Mr. SIKES. How will it be financed?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. We will reimburse the Security Corporation using surplus commodity funds.

Mr. SIKES. This hospital was funded last year, was it not?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Under "Surplus commodity."

It was authorized and appropriated under "Surplus commodity" funds.

General CURTIN. It was authorized under the surplus commodity program, but funds within the United Kingdom sterling were never generated so that this and the housing program could go forward.

We had in hand an action to transfer some sterling that had been generated and was allocated for housing in Bermuda to this very high priority requirement here when the change in administration of the surplus commodity program came about, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONAS. $24,400 a bed sounds pretty high to me. Is it advisable to build that expensive a facility on foreign soil where we may not be using it indefinitely?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. In reference to the cost, sir, we are using the same unit cost on this facility that we use on all hundred-bed facilities adjusted geographically to the England area. In other words, it is $30 a square foot times the geographical factor of 1.2, which gives us our building to the 5-foot line cost. To this we add the utility cost.

Mr. JONAS. That is still $28,400 a bed. That is far in excess of construction costs in the United States.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The geographical factor for England, sir, is 1.2, which means 20 percent greater than we experience in the United States.

Mr. SIKES. This is to be what type of construction?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. It will be permanent-type construction, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Would it not be advisable when we are in a country through sufferance and for a limited period of time, to build structures less costly than permanent structures?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. I am not sure I am qualified to answer that question.

General CURTIN. A general observation, sir: When I first went to the United Kingdom in 1954, this was the philosophy and we were trying to use at that time prefabricated hutting which was known locally as Seco hutting. Actually, as we analyzed this against local brick construction, where there is plenty of brick and brickmasons, or bricklayers, we found we could actually buy the permanent construction cheaper than we could get this Seco hutting erected, particularly for facilities of this type.

Mr. JONAS. What would be the possibility if we move out of this location in the next 10 years of disposing of this hospital? What will happen to it?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. I can speak to that, sir. In addition to meeting our requirements, it has to be approved by the British Ministry of Health.

General CURTIN. This facility would fall under the regular Government-to-Government agreements under which when we march out

of a station or give up a station in the United Kingdom, the two services get together and audit the property and ascribe to it a book value. This, then, is agreed to by both Governments and under the terms of the agreement, this is kept for a final adjustment. What that adjustment will ever be, no one can foresee, I guess, but the bookkeeping is done this way.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Sikes has an idea.

That is all.

FAMILY HOUSING IN ITALY

Mr. SIKES. Now, to the request for family housing in Italy, will you please provide for the record a very complete breakdown showing cost, site problems, if any, and answer generally the same type questions that I asked about the hospital?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

FISCAL YEAR 60 REPROGRAMING—SITE I–5—ITALY

Detailed cost estimate

I. Family housing (133 units):	
Construction of units to 5-foot line	$1,490,000
Utilities and site development	412,000
Government costs (design, construction supervision, overhead)	341,000
Contingencies	112,000
Total, housing cost	2,355,000
Average cost per unit	17,714
II. School (5,530 square feet):	
Construction	100,000
Government costs	18,000
Contingencies	5,900
Total, school cost	123,900
III. Commissary (3,500 square feet):	
Construction	50,000
Government costs	9,000
Contingencies	3,000
Total, commissary cost	62,000

GENERAL INFORMATION, SITE I–5

I. LOCAL ECONOMY HOUSING

Local economy has been investigated and no local housing will be available; industrial development has leased recently every available adequate dwelling in the area.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Site development plans are complete and construction plans are nearly complete. Plans which were used by the U.S. Army elsewhere in the area are being site adapted for use on this project. Construction will be stucco on hollow tile exterior walls, concrete floors with terrazzo surface, and tile roofs. (This is the cheapest type construction in Italy). The units will be two-story row housing with two, three, and four bedrooms per unit.

The construction contract can be signed within 90 days following receipt of necessary congressional approvals. Construction will take from 12 to 18 months.

III. PROJECT FINANCING

All construction costs will be financed with surplus commodity Italian lire purchased from CCC. The only dollar requirement will be for approximately $350,000 to cover Government (Corps of Engineers) costs.

This item requests an appropriation of $2,355,000 to provide 133 units of family housing at site I–5, Italy. The project will be apportioned approximately 30 percent to officers and 70 percent to airmen with units ranging from two-bedroom to 4-bedroom and varying in floor areas within authorized space limitations. Construction will consist of concrete footers and foundations; concrete slab floors; exterior walls—stucco on hollow tile; plastered interior walls; and tile roof. The units will be constructed at an estimated basic unit cost of $14,600 per family unit plus an expenditure of $412,000 for off-site utilities and site preparation. The units will be constructed on land already acquired from the host government.

The gross housing requirement for authorized personnel is 204 units. There is no existing on-base housing. Construction of the proposed 133 units will provide on-base housing for 65 percent of the authorized requirement.

SHELL HOUSING MODIFICATION

Mr. SIKES. Will you provide a breakdown for the record on the locations of the shell housing modification?

(The information requested follows:)

BREAKOUT OF SHELL HOUSING MODIFICATION

This item requests $1,621,000 for rehabilitation, alteration, and improvement of 712 units of 2-bedroom fourplex "shell" housing at 7 locations. When completed these units will convert to 356 three- and four-bedroom duplexes. These units which were constructed in 1945–47 were originally authorized and designed as four-bedroom duplexes, however, because of a fund limitation per family unit they were constructed as two-bedroom four-family units. In many instances there was not sufficient money to completely finish the interiors of the structures hence the name "shell" housing. Although the units have subsequently been finished throughout, they are extremely small and lack many of the normal amenities such as sufficient closet and storage space, and utility rooms. The second floor units have an exposed outside stairway leading from the kitchen.

The work required to effect this modification consists of removing common dividing walls, enlarging and modernizing the kitchen and baths, converting the second kitchen into a utility room, enlarging the living room and providing dining room space, adding storage and closet space, repairing interior floors and wall surfaces, and repainting as required. The units were originally designed for ultimate conversion into two-family, four-bedroom facilities.

Following is a detailed breakout listing the specific installations and units involved:

Installation	Current number of units	Number of units after modification	Estimated cost
			Thousands
Andrews, Maryland	128	64	$242
Castle, California	60	30	151
Ellsworth, South Dakota	188	94	438
Lowry, Colorado	88	44	202
Mountain Home, Idaho	120	60	302
Scott, Illinois	76	38	179
Travis, California	52	26	107
Total	712	356	1,621

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. We will meet again at 10 o'clock Monday, gentlemen. Thank you very much.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What space standards have been used in developing this requirement?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is the recruit training and housing facility.

Colonel BOCKELMAN. We use standard dormitory requirement factors for computing this requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it true that the original design capacity of the dormitories was based on housing three men in a room?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you make any allowance for the fact that the trainee is at Lackland for a relatively short time in planning this space per man?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. We do not make special provision for the length of time they stay there. Standard requirement factors are used.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, your workload of three men to a space is established to the degree you have to have it irrespective of the fact they are there only a short time; is that correct?

General CURTIN. The I-type barracks were originally designed as open bay and later converted to room-type barracks. There were, as has been testified, supposed to be three men per room. This is evident from the three closets laid out in the design.

These barracks, however, were envisioned to be room-type barracks for use by the permanent party and by students other than the basic recruits.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you have a regular requirement aside from just the students?

General CURTIN. That is right. The open-bay dormitories are still envisioned as desirable for the recruit training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who is being housed there?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. In the I-type dormitory?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel BOCKELMAN. Permanent party airmen, tech training students, precommission training students.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you get the record break that down, please, as to specified types of occupants.

(The information requested follows:)

Lackland AFB has no student officer quarters and therefore, all student officers are housed in I-type dormitories. The personnel who presently live in the I-type dormitories at Lackland are:

Language school (foreign students)	460
Basic WAF	400
Permanent party personnel	2,739
Officer's Candidate School	316
Officer's Training School	212
Personnel Training School	605
Air Police School	804
Crypto Training School	522
Basic Medical School	483
Personnel awaiting training	280
Officer technical students	80
Marksmanship School	48
Transit airmen	56
Basic airmen [1]	2,000
Table	9,005

[1] Temporary arrangement pending completion of O. & M. project on open-bay dormitories.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you receive authorization for additional troop housing at Lackland in what fiscal year will you request funds?

General CURTIN. In addition to that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In addition.

General CURTIN. If any additional authorization were forthcoming it would have to be in the 1962 program if it is over and above the 1,000 men we are now considering for recruit training. Presumably it would be funded in that year, Mr. Chairman.

Mr SHEPPARD. Will the workload justify further expenditures?

General CURTIN. Certainly there is a requirement, and a very definite requirement, for properly housing the recruits. To say at this point in time that additional barracks of this type or any other type will be requested is presumptive on my part until we see what the total requirements are for the 1962 program and how this requirement would compete in terms of priority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would your space deficiency be if you used the Air Force evaluation of the I-dormitories which was 11,700 spaces and the Lackland Training Command evaluation of the upgraded mobilization open-bay barracks which was 11,047?

Colonel BOCKELMAN. There is a difference of roughly 3,000 in the two computations for the I-type dormitory.

Mr. GIBBENS. In the mobilization dormitories I think there are about 234 that would be and could be considered for upgrading. Under those conditions it would add something around 2,500 to 2,800 spaces.

I think this could be balanced off, however, by the fact there are about 77 mobilization dormitories on the base amounting to about 2,800 spaces which we feel are ready for salvage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of the A. & E. work?

Colonel EDMONDS. I do not have the status, Mr. Chairman.

General CURTIN. I have a set of the plans.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would not answer the question. Find out the status of that work and when it will be finalized. Also let us know whether you intend to issue the contract upon the original specifications or finalization of the specifications.

Colonel EDMONDS. I do have something on it here, Mr. Chairman. The architect-engineer is Addis E. Noonan Associates and Jerry Rogers. My report shows about 5 percent complete.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will you do about the issuance of the contract?

Colonel EDMONDS. We will not advertise for bids until we have complete plans and specifications, Mr. Chairman.

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Turning now to Air Defense Command, insert in the record page 63 and all the pages listed thereon, including the usual general statement and the planning data.

(The information referred to follows:)

Installation	Command	Appropriation request (thousands)
Duluth Municipal Airport	Air Defense Command	$197
Geiger Field	do	456
Grand Forks Air Force Base	do	2,699
Hamilton Air Force Base	do	579
K. I. Sawyer Airport	do	3,422
Kincheloe Air Force Base	do	4,783
Kingsley Field	do	436
McChord Air Force Base	do	1,111
Minot Air Force Base	do	4,130
Otis Air Force Base	do	209
Oxnard Air Force Base	do	987
Paine Field	do	1,976
Richards Gebaur Air Force Base	do	240
Selfridge Air Force Base	do	5,177
Suffolk County Air Force Base	do	505
Tyndall Air Force Base	do	1,297
Total		28,204

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	DULUTH MUN APT	GOVT LEASED	348
DIR TO TOWN	4 MI SE DULUTH	GOVT OWNED	727
COUNTY, STATE	ST. LOUIS, MINN.	OTHER ACRES	131
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1206
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1951
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC) DULUTH AIR DEF SECTOR HQ (SAGE DC) FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ANG)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
247	10	1681	18	1956		219

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
48,000	20,632	16,985	10,383	197	10,186

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP	174		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	47
TRAILER CT. PARKING	516		NEW	90		90	75	TR	150
									197

Duluth Municipal Airport

Duluth Municipal Airport is located approximately 4 miles northwest of Duluth, Minn. The planned use of Duluth Municipal Airport is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, an air defense missile mission, and an air defense sector headquarters.

The program being requested amounts to $197,000 and is composed of the following items:

A precision measurement equipment laboratory for the calibration and maintenance of essential test equipment necessary for the accurate adjustment of subcomponents of complex weapons systems. No facilities are available to perform this essential requirement.

The next item is for a trailer court to accommodate the individually owned trailers of assigned military personnel. Existing offbase courts are overcrowded, health and safety conditions are below minimum Air Force standard, and most courts are beyond established permissible travel time and distance criteria. Existing Air Force housing and housing under construction do not fulfill the total family housing requirement for assigned personnel. This item will provide approximately 80 percent of the total requirement for trailers.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lab prec meas equip	District engineer	$3.0	0
Trailer court parking	do	6.0	3

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	GEIGER FLD	GOVT LEASED	657
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI NNE SPOKANE	GOVT OWNED	306
COUNTY, STATE	SPOKANE, WASH.	OTHER ACRES	
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	963
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1940
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ	REACT	1951
	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (ANG)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
129	10	1070	15	1224		206

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
20,000	9,524	6,548	3,928	456	3,472

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING,APPROACH	MOD	67		NEW	A/R		LS		LS	38
SHOP,ARM&ELECT,BASE	DFRP	15		NEW	12,650		12,650	12,650	SF	348
STOR,BSE,JET FUEL		446		NEW	27,000	17,000	10,000	10,000	BL	70
										456

GEIGER FIELD

Geiger Field is located 5 miles south of Spokane, Wash.

The planned use of this field is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission.

The program being requested amounts to $456,000 for facilities at Geiger Field.

The first item provides for the modification of the approach lighting system to provide roll bars to improve guidance and directional reference essential for night operation of century series interceptor aircraft.

An armament and electronics shop is the next item requested. This facility is required for the repair and maintenance of equipment and accessories used in fighter interceptor aircraft. Presently a small substandard facility of 2,742 square feet is being used to perform this function. The requested facility will fulfill the total requirement.

The last item will provide a 10,000-barrel aboveground jet fuel storage tank to complete the total requirements for this facility.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	District engineer	$2.0	0
Shop, arm and elec, base	Unknown	10.5	0
Stor, base, jet fuel	do	3.0	0

FY — 1961

APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	GRAND FORKS AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	16 MI E GRAND FORKS	GOVT OWNED	5,266
COUNTY, STATE	GRAND FORKS, N. D.	OTHER ACRES	142
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,408
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	N/A

PRINCIPAL MISSION
FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ
GRAND FORKS AIR DEF SECTOR HQ (SAGE DC)
HVY BOMB SQ (SAC)
AUGMENTATION (SAC)
HVY AIR REFUEL SQ (½) (SAC)
USAF HOSP

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
559	35	3444	53	4091		302

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
108,000	41,495	59,036	7,469	2,699	4,770

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
CORROSION CON FAC CV		323	SAC	NEW	1		1	1	EA	400
COMMUNICATIONS,BASE	ADDN	162		NEW	6,921	3,173	3,748	1,400	SF	47
TELEPHONE DUCT FAC	ADDN	335	SAC	NEW	A/R		LS		LS	47
OPERATIONS MISSION T		I	SAC	NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	80
MAINT,DOCK,LARGE A/C		I	SAC	NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	1,073
SHOP ARM&ELECT BASE	ADDN	346	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	170
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		175		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	49
IE,MAINTENANCE SHOP	ADDN	508		NEW	11,800	6,194	5,606	5,606	SF	122
CONFINEMENT FACILITY		520		NEW	3,500		3,500	3,500	SF	132
OPEN MESS,NCO	ADDN	199		NEW	14,000	6,597	7,403	7,403	SF	250
RCTN,GYMNASIUM	ADDN	523		NEW	16,600	10,584	6,016	6,016	SF	172
WATER SUPPLY	MOD	206		NEW	2,061	1,200	861	861	TD	157
										2,699

Grand Forks Air Force Base

Grand Forks Air Force Base is located approximately 16 miles west of Grand Forks, N. Dak. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission and a Strategic Air Command bomber and tanker mission. It is also to be used as an Air Defense sector headquarters.

The total program being requested amounts to $2,699,000. Of this amount, $1,770,000 is for five items in support of the Strategic Air Command.

The remainder of the items are required to support either the Air Defense Command mission or all assigned units.

The first item is a covered corrosion control facility which is required to support the maintenance and operation of assigned Strategic Air Command aircraft by keeping them properly cleaned at all items to eliminate corrosion, drag and assist dissipation of heat from engines. Severe winter weather experienced in this northern region necessitates a covered facility. No facilities exists that can be utilized for this purpose. Requested facility will satisfy the total requirement for this item.

The next item is for an addition to the base communication building to support the expanded mission. While 3,173 square feet exists, a deficiency of 3,748 square feet remains. This request of 1,400 square feet will partially fulfill the deficiency.

The next item is for an underground duct system for telephone cables in support of SAC communications. This item will meet the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is requested for an operational mission training building to house an electronic counter measure trainer, gunnery trainer and cockpit procedure trainer used to support the SAC mission. No facilities exist that can be utilized for this purpose. Requested project will fulfill the requirement for this function.

The next item is for two aircraft maintenance docks. The total requirement is for seven docks, four docks are existing, the deficiency is three docks. Request will satisfy two-thirds of the deficiency.

The next item is for an addition to the armament and electronics shop for the storage and maintenance of electronic equipment utilized by the SAC bomber aircraft. B–52's are constantly being improved by providing more electronic equipment and replacing old equipment with more complex systems. These systems now require twice as many checks; therefore, this addition is required to accommodate added functions due to this increase in equipment. Requested addition will satisfy the total requirement for this function.

The next item is a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facility exists that can be utilized for this purpose. This project will satisfy the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is for an addition to the civil engineers maintenance shop. The total requirement is for 11,800 square feet, of which 6,194 square feet is existing, leaving a deficit of 5,606 square feet which is requested in this program. Base expansion, since the original shop was constructed, makes the existing facility totally inadequate and this addition necessary.

The next item is for a confinement facility. No facility is available which can be utilized for this purpose. Presently temporary confinement of prisoners is accomplished in part of the air police headquarters buildings. However, this space is urgently needed for air police security and law-enforcement administration and operation. Establishment of this facility will satisfy the total requirement at this base in addition to providing a facility for the confinement of prisoners from other Air Force installations in the surrounding geographical area.

The next item is for an addition to the noncommissioned officers open mess. Off base recreational and social facilities are not only distant but are very limited and travel during the long winter months is extremely difficult and hazardous. The requirement for the noncommissioned officers open mess is 14,000 square feet, of which 6,597 square feet exists. This request will complete the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is for an addition to the gymnasium which is required to provide sufficient space for the conduct of physical conditioning since northern bases experience long periods of inclement weather. The requested addition will fulfill the total requirement for gymnasium facilities.

The last item is for construction of an intermediate pumping station on the existing water supply main to the base. Construction of this station is the most economical means of providing the base with an increased water supply which is required as a result of the increased missions. The requirement for water supply is for 2,061,000 gallons per day, existing supply furnishes 1,200,000 gallons, leaving a deficiency of 861,00 gallons. Requested project will fulfill the total requirement for water supply.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Corrosion con fac ev	Unknown	20.0	0
Communications, base	do	2.0	23
Telephone duct fac	do	2.0	30
Operations mission T	Forx-Stanley Engineering Co	6.0	30
Maint dock large A/C	District engineer	37.0	75
Shop arm and elec base	Forx-Stanley Engineering Co	9.5	30
Lab prec meas equip	District engineer	1.5	30
IE maintenance shop	do	5.0	30
Confinement facility	do	5.2	30
Open mess, NCO	do	9.5	30
Retn gymnasium	do	6.0	30
Water supply	Unknown	7.8	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	HAMILTON AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI SSW SAN RAFAEL	GOVT OWNED	1,884
COUNTY, STATE	MARIN, CALIF.	OTHER ACRES	302
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,186
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1933
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ	REACT	1945
	4th AF HQ (CNC)		
	AIR TRANSP SQ (L) (CNC)		
	TRP CARR SQ (MED) (RES)		
	AIR RES (NAV TRNG) SQ (RES)		
	AACS (FAC CHECK) FLT (MTC)		
	USAF HOSPITAL		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
607	50	3111	56	3824		951

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
44,000	27,023	11,331	5,646	579	5,067

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHLTR,A/C,WEAPON CAL	ADDN	501		NEW	3,162	1,920	1,242	1,242	SF	49
SHOP GROUND POW EQ		171		149	12,038	7,464	4,574	4,574	SF	160 R
DORMITORY,AIRMEN	RPMT	519		NEW	1,612	3,163		200	MN	370
										579

Hamilton Air Force Base

Hamilton Air Force Base is located 6 miles northeast of San Rafael, Calif.

The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, 4th Air Force headquarters, a medium troop carrier squadron (Reserve), an air rescue squadron (Reserve), and a light air transport squadron (CONAC).

The total program being requested at Hamilton amounts to $579,000 and consists of three items:

The first item requested is an aircraft weapons calibration shelter, which will be constructed as an addition to a previously approved shelter. The requested facility will fulfill the total requirement.

The second item is for a ground-powered equipment shop which is required for the maintenance and repair of approximately 199 pieces of equipment. Currently this function is being performed on an interim basis in a building originally constructed as a base warehouse. Continued utilization cannot be made of this substandard space for the shop function without adverse affect. If the requested facility is provided the space presently being utilized will be used to satisfy a part of the covered storage requirement for this expensive and complicated equipment. Lack of the requested shop will adversely affect the operationally ready rate of Air Defense Command aircraft.

The last item requested provides for the replacement of substandard World War II mobilization barracks with a 200-man dormitory. The total requirement is for 1,612 spaces. There are only 1,177 standard spaces existing. This project will provide approximately 85 percent of the airmen housing requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shl tr, A/C weapon cal	District engineer	4.7	3
Shop gr pow equip	do	11.7	90
Dormitory airmen	do	28.7	65

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	K.I. SAWYER AFB	GOVT LEASED	2,000
DIR TO TOWN	7 MI SSW GWINN	GOVT OWNED	2,392
COUNTY, STATE	MARQUETTE, MICH.	OTHER ACRES	9
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,401
COMMAND	ADC	DATE OCC	1956
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ SAULT STE MARIE AIR DEF SECTOR HQ (SAGE DC) HVY BOMB SQ (SAC) AUGMENTATION (SAC) HVY AIR REFUEL SQ (SAC) USAF HOSPITAL		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
606	10	3598	15	4229		263

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
91,000	20,455	57,734	12,811	3,422	9,389

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
TAXIWAY,APRON ACCESS	ADDN	447		NEW	42,557	17,001	25,556	4,000	SY	49
CORROSION CON FAC CV		324	SAC	NEW	1		1	1	EA	400
OPER.MISSION TNG.		I	SAC	NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	80
MAINT.DOCK,LARGE A/C		I	SAC	NEW	8	5	3	2	EA	866
SHOP ARM&ELEC BASE	ADDN	347	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	170
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		176		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	40
STOR.BSE.JET FUEL		183		NEW	129,863	64,552	65,311	20,000	BL	128
COLD STGE,FOOD,BASE	ADDN	184		149	4,315	1,588	2,727	2,727	SF	111
HQ,GROUP,AIR BASE	ADDN	188		NEW	16,380	6,358	10,022	10,022	SF	198
HEADQUARTERS SQD.		189		149	24,970	5,600	19,370	5,545	SF	127
HEADQUARTERS,WING		33	SAC	NEW	10,050		10,050	10,050	SF	250
TRLR.CT.PARKING		517		NEW	100		100	100	TR	200
CHAPEL,W/ANNEX	ADDN	194		NEW	8,700	2,522	6,178	3,800	SF	153
STORE,COMMISSARY	ADDN	196		NEW	17,589	7,589	10,000	10,000	SF	254
OPEN MESS, OFF	ADDN	201		149	14,107	2,845	11,262	11,262	SF	396
										3,422

K. I. Sawyer AFB

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base is located approximately 7 miles northwest of Gwinn, Mich. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter-interceptor mission, a Strategic Air Command bomber and tanker mission, and an Air Defense Command sector headquarters.

The total program being requested amounts to $3,422,000. Of this amount, $1,766,000 is for five items in support of the Strategic Air Command mission. The remainder of the items are required to support either the Air Defense Command mission or all assigned units.

The first item is for an apron access taxiway to permit the more efficient and safer utilization of the existing fighter-interceptor operational parking pavement. The present apron configuration restricts aircraft movement with resultant hazard to both aircraft and ground-operating personnel, particularly during hours of darkness and winter operation. Winter expectancy in this area is 7 months with heavy snowfall and icing.

The next item is a covered corrosion control facility which is required to support the maintenance and operation of assigned Strategic Air Command aircraft by keeping them properly cleaned at all times to eliminate corrosion, excessive drag, and assist dissipation of heat from engines. Severe winter weather experienced in this northern region necessitates a covered facility. No facility exists that can be utilized for this purpose. Requested facility will satisfy the total requirement of this item.

The next item is an operational mission training building to house the training instruments and devices scheduled for this base. These items consist of an electronic countermeasure trainer, gunnery trainer, and cockpit procedure trainer used to support the SAC mission. No facility exists that can be utilized or converted for this purpose. Requested projects will fulfill the requirement for this function.

The next item is for two aircraft maintenance docks. The total requirement is for eight docks, five docks are existing, the deficiency is three docks. Request will provide two-thirds of the deficiency.

The next item is for an addition to the armament and electronics shop for the storage and maintenance of electronic equipment utilized by the SAC bomber aircraft. B–52 aircraft are constantly being improved by providing more electronic equipment and replacing old equipment with more complex systems. These systems now require twice as many checks to maintain; therefore, this addition is required to accommodate added functions due to this increase in equipment. Requested addition will satisfy the total requirement for this function.

The next item is a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facility exists that can be utilized or converted for this special purpose. This project will satisfy the total requirement for this facility.

The next item provides 20,000 barrels of jet fuel storage. Existing storage is insufficient and resupply which is by tank truck from St. Ignace, Mich., requires 24 hours' advance notice prior to delivery. The total requirement for jet fuel storage is 129,863 barrels, with 64,522 barrels either existing or under construction, leaving a deficit of 65,311 barrels. The requested projects will be to fill approximately 65 percent of the requirement.

The next item is for an addition to the cold storage food building. This addition to the existing building is necessary to store additional meat and perishable foods requiring refrigerated storage as a result of manpower increases for this base. The total requirement for cold food storage is 4,315 square feet, with 1,588 square feet existing, leaving a deficit of 2,727 square feet which is being requested.

The next item is for an addition to the airbase group headquarters building. This addition is necessary to provide sufficient space for administration of base headquarters activities which have increased as a result of mission increases. The existing facility is totally inadequate and has forced the interim use of a portion of existing dormitory and BOQ space for administrative functions. There are no other facilities existing that can be converted or utilized for this purpose. If this project is not provided, continued utilization will have to be made of the dormitory and BOQ which will result in a shortage of this critically needed space. The requested project will fulfill the total requirement for this function.

The next item is for a squadron headquarters facility. K. I. Sawyer has a requirement for squadron headquarters buildings to support the eight non-

tactical squadrons being assigned. A squadron headquarters building has been recently completed and another is under construction. This leaves a deficit of six facilities. This is a new base and there are no existing facilities that can be utilized for this purpose. The requested project will fulfill one-half of the requirement for squadron headquarters.

The next item is a wing headquarters building to house the wing commander, control room, and other staff officers necessary for the support of the assigned SAC mission. There are no facilities existing that can be converted or utilized for this function. This project will satisfy the total requirement.

The next item is a trailer court to accommodate the individually owned trailers of assigned military personnel. Community facilities are high in cost, inadequate, beyond established traveling time and distance criteria, and below minimum Air Force standards. Existing Air Force housing and housing under construction do not fulfill the total requirement for this function.

The next two items provide for an addition to the existing chapel and chapel annex and the commissary store, to accommodate increase in personnel. The existing chapel with annex was constructed to support a single fighter interceptor squadron. The addition of a SAC and SAGE mission to this base makes the existing facility totally inadequate. The total chapel requirement is for 900 seats, with 150 seats existing; this leaves a deficit of 750 seats. The requested addition will provide a capacity of 30 percent of the total requirement. A commissary store is required to provide an accessible location for the purchase of foodstuff by base personnel. There will soon be over 1,200 families who will occupy on-base housing. K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base is located in an area that is subject to hazardous driving conditions in the winter, and the nearest adequate food shopping center is located approximately 22 miles from the base. Distance from adequate facilities, together with hazardous winter driving, makes it necessary that the existing inadequate store be enlarged so that all families living on base can be accommodated. The total requirement is for 17,589 square feet. Existing 7,589 square feet leaves a deficit of 10,000 square feet which is being requested.

The last item requested is an addition to the officers' open mess. The total requirement is for 14,107 square feet, of which 2,845 square feet is existing, leaving an 11,262-square-foot deficit. The requested project will fulfill the total requirement. The existing facility is completely inadequate and there are no other facilities on base to meet this requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Taxiway apron access	District engineer	$2.5	0
Corrosion con fac	do	16.5	0
Oper mission tng	do	4.0	0
Maint dock large	do	20.0	75
Shop arm and elec base	do	9.0	0
Lab prec meas equip	do	2.0	0
Stor base jet fuel	do	6.5	0
Cold, stge, food base	do	6.0	100
Hq group air base	do	10.0	0
Headquarters sqd	do	6.5	100
Headquarters wing	do	8.0	0
Trlr. ct. parking	do	10.0	0
Chapel, /w/ annex	do	8.0	0
Store commissary	do	12.5	0
Open mess off	do	19.5	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

FY — 1961

APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	KINCHELOE AFB	GOVT LEASED	2,792
DIR TO TOWN	18 MI NNE KINROSS	GOVT OWNED	807
COUNTY, STATE	CHIPPEWA, MICH.	OTHER ACRES	2,305
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	5,904
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ REACT AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC) HVY BOMB SQ (SAC) AUGMENTATION (SAC) ½ HVY AIR REFUEL SQ (SAC) USAF HOSPITAL		1952

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
440	10	3118	15	3583		252

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
88,000	27,501	45,902	14,597	4,783	9,814

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
PAD,WARMUP-HOLDING		26		NEW	48,933	33,633	15,300	15,300	SY	261
CORROSION CON FAC CV		325	SAC	NEW	1		1	1	EA	400
LIGHTING APPROACH		496		NEW	4,500	3,000	1,500	1,500	FT	57
LIGHTING, R/W NGCL		165		NEW	A/R		LS		LS	336
OPER.MISSION TNG.		I	SAC	NEW	2,200		2,200	2,200	SF	80
MAINT.DOCK,LARGE A/C		I	SAC	NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	993
AUTO MAINT SHOP		502		685	33,000	17,220	15,780	10,920	SF	228
AUTO STGE HEATED		504		685	28,836	4,000	24,836	8,000	SF	85
SHOP ARM &ELEC.	ADDN	348	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	170
SHOP,GRND POWRD EQIP		505		NEW	24,915	4,000	20,915	4,300	SF	100
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		177		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	40
COLD STOR.FOOD.BASE	DFRP	185		NEW	4,315	1,050	3,265	4,315	SF	155
HOBASE UNIT A/POLICE	DFRP	515		NEW	2,650		2,650	2,650	SF	65

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY -1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION KINCHELOE AFB ADC

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
HEADQUARTERS,WING		34	SAC	NEW	10,050		10,050	10,050	SF	312
OQ,MEN		191		NEW	98	49	49	24	MN	270
CHAPEL,W/ANNEX	ADDN	195		NEW	6,100	2,644	3,465	3,800	SF	143
EXCHANGE,SALES STORE	DFRP	198		NEW	17,700	4,098	13,602	12,062	SF	269
OPEN MESS,NCO	ADDN	200		NEW	14,000	4,400	9,600	9,600	SF	309
OPEN MESS,OFFICER	DFRP	203		NEW	14,000		14,000	7,500	SF	351
SHOP GRND POWRD EQUIP		172		149	24,915	4,000	20,915	5,000	SF	159 R
										4,783

KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE

Kincheloe AFB is located approximately 18 miles southwest of Kinross, Mich. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, an Air Defense missile mission, and a Strategic Air Command bomber and tanker mission.

The total program being requested amounts to $4,783,000. Of this amount, $1,955,000 is required for five items to support the Strategic Air Command mission. The remainder of the items are required to support either the Air Defense Command mission or all assigned units.

The first item is a warmup holding pad. Warmup holding pads are required to provide an area for the final portion of warmup and instrument and engine checks without interrupting normal traffic. They permit uninterrupted flow of traffic between taxiway and runway in case of breakdowns or malfunctions. A pad permits the holding of an aircraft awaiting clearance for takeoff without blocking the runway or taxiways. The requirement for warmup holding pad is 48,933 square yards of which 33,633 square yards exists or is under construction, leaving a deficit of 15,300 square yards. This request will complete the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is covered corrosion control facility which is required to support the maintenance and operation of assigned Strategic Air Command aircraft by keeping them properly cleaned at all times to eliminate corrosion, excessive drag, and assist dissipation of heat from engines. Severe winter weather experienced in this northern region necessitates a covered facility. No facility exists that can be used or converted for this purpose. This project will satisfy the total requirements for this function.

The next item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. national standard approach lighting at the secondary (southeast) end of the primary instrument runway. This lighting is essential for the safe and efficient operation of high performance jet aircraft assigned to this base. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

The next item is narrow gage and centerline runway lighting, which is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required at bases chosen as an area "safe haven" for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely adverse weather conditions. This lighting consists of a system of high intensity lights embedded 30 feet from and parallel to the centerline of the runway for the first 3,200 feet, the landing zone. From this point, smaller lights are embedded at regular intervals along the remainder of the runway to allow for accurate directional control and normal deceleration. The requested item will fulfill the total requirement for this special facility.

The next item is an operational mission training building to house the training instruments and devices scheduled for this base. These items consist of an electronic countermeasure trainer, gunnery trainer, and cockpit procedure trainer used to support the SAC mission. No buildings exist that can be used or converted for this purpose. Requested project will fulfill the requirement for this function.

The next item is for two aircraft maintenance docks. The total requirement is for seven docks, with four docks existing. This leaves a deficit of three docks. This project will satisfy two-thirds of the deficiency.

The next two items provide an automotive maintenance shop and a heated storage building. Automotive maintenance and storage facilities are required to maintain and store Government vehicles that must be readily available to perform the base mission efficiently. At present, interim utilization is being made of totally inadequate facilities to perform this function. The requirement for auto maintenance is 33,000 square feet, of which 17,220 square feet exists, leaving a deficit of 15,780 square feet. The requested facility will fulfill approximately 85 percent of the requirement. The requirement for heated auto storage is 28,836 square feet, of which only 4,000 square feet exists, leaving a deficit of 24,836 square feet. The requested project will satisfy approximately 42 percent of the total requirement.

The next item is for an addition to the armament and electronics shop for the storage and maintenance of electronic equipment used by the SAC bomber aircraft. B–52 aircraft are constantly being improved by providing more electronic equipment and replacing old equipment with more complex systems. These systems require twice as many checks to maintain. Therefore, this addition

is required to accommodate added functions due to the increase in equipment. Requested addition will satisfy the total requirement for this function.

The next and the last items requested are for a ground power equipment shop which is required for the maintenance and repair of approximately 347 pieces of equipment. Currently, this function in support of the fighter-interceptor squadron is being performed on an interim basis in an existing butler building. This building is not adequate to support the entire mission in either space or shop area. If the requested project is approved, the existing buildings will be used to satisfy a part of the requirement for the storage of this very important equipment. The requirement for ground power equipment shop is 24,915 square feet, of which 4,000 square feet is existing and 8,000 square feet has been previously programed, leaving a 12,915-square-foot deficit. The requested facility will fulfill approximately 65 percent of the total requirement.

The next item is a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facility exists that can be used or converted for this special purpose. This project will fulfill the total requirement for this function.

The next item is a cold storage food building which is required for the storage of perishable subsistence prior to its issue to the commissary store or dining halls. Currently, this function is being performed in 1,050 square feet of space in the corner of warehouse No. 1. However, this space is totally inadequate and a constant acceptable temperature cannot be maintained. This space should be returned to normal warehouse use as the need is urgent. This project will satisfy the total requirement for cold storage.

The next item is air police headquarters building. This building is required to provide operational and administrative space for the air police and provost marshal functions. These functions are presently located in a canvas "Jamesway" building which is totally inadequate and will be demolished upon completion of this project. The excessive period of subzero weather experienced at this base, the lack of adequate heat, and the overcrowded working conditions make the present building entirely unsatisfactory. This project will satisfy the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is a wing headquarters building to house the wing commander, control room, and other staff offices necessary for the support of the assigned SAC mission. There are no facilities existing that can be utilized or converted for this function. The requested project will satisfy the total requirement.

The next item requested is for bachelor officer housing. The requirement is for 98 men. There is housing existing for 49 men, leaving a deficit of 49 men. The request in this program is for 24 men, leaving a deficiency of 25 spaces.

The next item is for an addition to the existing chapel and chapel annex. The existing chapel with annex was constructed to support a single fighter interceptor squadron. The addition of a SAC and defense missile mission to this base, in addition to the construction of 1,190 housing units, makes the existing facility very inadequate. This base is isolated and 6 months of the year, due to icy conditions, driving on the roads is hazardous. The chapel requirement is for 600 seats. There are 150 seats existing, leaving a deficit of 450 seats. This project will provide the base with a total of one-half of its requirement.

The next item is exchange sales store. An adequate exchange sales store is required to meet the needs of the assigned personnel and to support satellite exchanges at other military installations within the geographical area. The existing building of 4,098 square feet is substandard for exchange purposes due to its size, location, layout, and lack of expansibility. It is being used to its fullest capacity. Enlargement of the existing substandard facility is not feasible from an engineering or economical standpoint. The nearest commercial shopping center is 22 miles from the base, and hazardous road conditions during 6 months of the year make travel hazardous. Upon completion of the requested facility the existing building will be utilized for the base library.

The next item is for an addition to the NCO open mess. The total requirement is for 14,000 square feet, of which 4,400 square feet is existing, leaving a deficit of 9,600 square feet. The requested project will satisfy the total requirement for this function.

The next item is an officers' open mess. Presently, this function is being conducted in 3,260 square feet of the officers' dining hall. This space is totally inadequate and upon completion of the requested project it will revert to use as an officers' dining hall. Although this project will only fulfill about one-half of the requirement for this facility, it does provide the minimum facility that will help relieve the undesirable situation currently existing.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Pad, warmup holding	District engineer	$8.0	0
Corrosion con fac ev	do	14.5	0
Lighting approach	do	3.0	0
Lighting R/W ngel	do	10.0	0
Oper. Mission Tng	do	4.5	0
Maint dock, large A/C	do	20.0	75
Auto maint shop	Meathe-Kessler & Associates, Inc	17.0	100
Auto sto heated	Unknown	4.5	100
Shop arm and elec	District engineer	11.0	0
Shop, ground powrd equip	do	6.5	100
Shop grnd powrd equip	Unknown	9.0	0
Lab prec meas equip	do	2.0	0
Cold stor food base	do	7.0	0
Hq base unit A/Police	do	35.0	0
Headquarters wing	do	9.5	0
OQ, men	do	13.5	40
Chapel w/annex	do	7.0	20
Exchange sales store	do	8.0	0
Open mess NCO	do	15.5	20
Open mess, officer	do	16.0	20

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	KINGSLEY FLD	GOVT LEASED	266
DIR TO TOWN	5 MI NW KLAMATH FALLS	GOVT OWNED	51
COUNTY, STATE	KLAMATH, ORE.	OTHER ACRES	175
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	492
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1956
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
125	4	1086	3	1218		153

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
16,000	9,820	1,515	4,665	436	4,229

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		451		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	48
FLIGHT SURG.CLINIC	ADDN	452		NEW	8,694	5,894	2,800	2,800	SF	115
CHAPEL ANNEX	ADDN	453		NEW	2,600		2,600	2,600	SF	76
STORE,COMMISSARY		68		685	7,494		7,494	7,494	SF	197
										436

KINGSLEY FIELD

Kingsley Field is located approximately 5 miles southeast of Klamath Falls, Oreg. An Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission is the planned use for this base.

The total program being requested at Kingsley is $436,000 for four items.

The first item requested is a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facility exists that can be utilized or converted for the purpose.

The second item is an addition to the existing dispensary to provide a flight surgeon's clinic, which is urgently required to provide adequate space for aviation medicine activities and sufficient office and examining room space for assigned physicians. The requirement for medical space is for 8,694 square feet, of which 5,894 square feet exist, leaving a 2,800-square-foot deficit. The requested project will fulfill the total requirement.

The next item requested for this base is the addition of an annex to the existing 150-seat chapel for religious activities. Currently utilization is being made of the officers' dining hall. Such utilization of a make-do facility which is available only on Sunday, seriously curtails conduct of weekday activities.

The last item requested is a commissary store which is required to provide an accessible location for the purchase of foodstuff by base personnel and their dependents; 290 units of family housing recently constructed are now occupied. At present, a small facility of 3,065 square feet which is completely inadequate in size to accommodate authorized customers or stock items normally sold in a commissary is being used in the interim. Kingsley Field is located in an area that is subject to hazardous driving conditions during the winter season and the nearest adequate food market is located approximately 7 miles from the base. Distance from adequate facilities, together with hazardous winter driving, makes it necessary that an adequate facility be provided the family living on base for the purchase of foodstuff. Requested facility will fulfill the total requirement for this function.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lab prec meas equip	Naval district	$2.9	0
Flight surg clinic	do	6.9	0
Chapel annex	do	4.0	0
Store, commissary	do	9.8	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	McCHORD AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI N TAKOMA	GOVT OWNED	4,489
COUNTY, STATE	PIERCE, WASH.	OTHER ACRES	78
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	4,567
COMMAND	ADC	DATE OCC	1940
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ SEATTLE AIR DEF SECTOR HQ (SAGE DC) AIR DIV HQ (SAGE CC) HVY AIR REFUEL SQ (SAC) TRP CARR WG (H) (MTC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
839	35	4742	70	5686		1013

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
70,000	44,398	20,057	5,545	1,111	4,434

PROJECT TITLE	PRICRITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
DEFLECTOR,JET BLAST	211	SAC	NEW	1,920		1,920	1,920	FT	142
SHLTR,A/C,WEAPON CAL	13		NEW	11,505		11,505	6,140	SF	210
SHOP,A/C ENG I&REPR	168		NEW	26,500		26,500	26,500	SF	502
WATER SUPPLY, STGE	527		149	A/R		275,000	275,000	GA	257
									1,111

McChord Air Force Base

McChord Air Force Base is located approximately 1 mile south of Tacoma, Wash. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, a Strategic Air Command tanker mission, a Military Air Transport Command troop carrier wing, and an Air Defense Command division and sector headquarters.

The program being requested for McChord totals $1,111,000. Of this amount, $142,000 will provide jet blast deflectors in support of the Strategic Air Command's mission. This project is required to support the change in type of aircraft from propeller driven to jet.

Remaining items requested are an aircraft weapons calibration shelter, an aircraft engine inspection and repair shop, and water-supply storage.

A weapons calibration shelter is required to perform scheduled and unscheduled boresighting and harmonization of installed fixed fire control weapon systems on assigned aircraft. This request will satisfy 50 percent of the total requirement. No facilities are available that can be utilized for this special purpose.

An aircraft engine and inspection repair shop is required for the maintenance of the 275 jet and reciprocating engines of the ADC, MATS and SAC assigned aircraft. There are no structures existing that can be converted or utilized for this purpose. In the interim, engine maintenance is currently done on the floor of two aircraft maintenance hangars. Such utilization is unsuitable for engine maintenance and this hangar space is required for the troop carrier and tanker aircraft. This item will meet the total requirement for this facility.

The water supply storage project which consists of two tanks will provide the required quantity and pressure of water necessary to support sprinkler systems in three separate hangars. The protection of these facilities against fire is of the utmost importance to the defense capabilities of this base.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Deflector, jet blast	District engineer	$7.5	50
Shltr, A/C, weapon cal	Unknown	10.5	0
Shop, A/C eng and repr	Harlen H. Smith	25.0	50
Water supply, stge	District engineer	12.5	90

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION: MINOT AFB
DIR TO TOWN: 14 MI S MINOT
COUNTY, STATE: WARD, N.D.
COUNTRY:
COMMAND: ADC

GOVT LEASED:
GOVT OWNED: 4,430
OTHER ACRES: 427
TOTAL ACRES: 4,857

DATE OCC: NA

PRINCIPAL MISSION: FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ (under construction)
AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC)
MINOT AIR DEF SECTOR HQ
(SAGE DC)
HVY BOMB SQ (SAC)
AUGMENTATION (SAC)
½ HVY AIR REFUEL SQ (SAC)
USAF HOSPITAL

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	OAF
563	10	3668	35	4276		311

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
112,000	40,451	61,642	9,907	4,130	5,777

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
COMMUNICATIONS,BASE	ADDN	163		NEW	6,921	2,973	3,948	2,000	SF	60
LIGHTING R/W NGCL		166		NEW	A/R		LS		LS	350
MAINT.DOCK,LARGE A/C		I	SAC.	NEW	7	4	3	2	EA	1,198
SHOP,REFUELING VEH		169		NEW	3,400		3,400	2,776	SF	139
SHOP ARM&ELECT.	ADDN	349	SAC	NEW	17,050	12,400	4,650	4,650	SF	170
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		178		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	61
IE.MAINTENANCE SHOP	ADDN	509		NEW	11,800	5,992	5,808	5,808	SF	113
IE.STORAGE,COVERED	ADDN	511		NEW	14,160	5,248	8,912	8,912	SF	100
IE.STORAGE,SHED		512		NEW	9,440		9,440	9,440	SF	63
WHSE,SUP.& EQUIP,BSE	ADDN	186		NEW	130,728	94,214	36,514	21,000	SF	200
QQ,MEN		192		NEW	123	82	41	20	MN	228

OQ,MEN	192	NEW	123	82	41	20	MN	228

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY -1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION MINOT AFB ADC

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
CONFINEMENT FACILITY		521		NEW	3,500		3,500	3,500	SF	147
STORE,COMMISSARY	ADDN	197		NEW	18,910	11,168	7,742	7,742	SF	200
OPEN MESS,OFFICER	ADDN	202		NEW	14,000	6,625	7,375	7,375	SF	205
RCTN,GYMNASIUM	ADDN	524		NEW	16,600	10,830	5,770	5,770	SF	156
HEATING,PLANT	ADDN	204		NEW	4,600	3,350	1,250	1,250	HP	633
WATER SUPPLY STG		205		149	1858,000	900,000	958,000	425,000	GA	107
										4,130

Minot Air Force Base

Minot Air Force Base is located approximately 14 miles north of Minot, N. Dak. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, an Air Defense Command sector headquarters and a Strategic Air Command bomber and tanker mission.

The total program being requested amounts to $4,130,000. Of this amount, $1,368,000 is for two items in support of the Strategic Air Command mission. The remainder of the items are required to support either the Air Defense Command mission or all assigned units.

The first item is an addition to the base communications building to support the expanded mission. While 2,973 square feet exists, a deficiency of 3,948 square feet remains. This request of 2,000 square feet will partially fulfill the deficiency.

The next item is narrow gage and centerline runway lighting which is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required at bases chosen as an area safe haven, for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely adverse weather conditions. This lighting consists of a system of high intensity lights embedded 30 feet from and parallel to the centerline of the runway for the first 3,200 feet, the landing zone. From this point, smaller lights are embedded at regular intervals along the runway centerline for the remainder of the runway to allow for accurate directional control and normal deceleration. The requested project will fulfill the total requirement for this special facility.

The next item is for two aircraft maintenance docks. The total requirement is for seven docks, with four docks existing; this leaves a deficit of three docks. This project will satisfy two-thirds of the deficiency.

The next item is a shop for refueling vehicles. There are 34 vehicles assigned to this base for support of the ADC and SAC missions. A special maintenance and repair facility is required for the servicing of refueling vehicles due to hazardous fumes. This function cannot be performed under contract in the local area because of the lack of adequate commercial garage facilities to handle these large semitrailer vehicles and their inability to meet safety requirements. There are no other facilities existing or programed in which this work can be performed. The requested project will satisfy approximately 82 percent of the total requirement.

The next item is for an addition to the armament and electronics shop for the storage and maintenance of electronic equipment utilized by the SAC bomber aircraft. B–52 aircraft are constantly being improved by providing more electronic equipment and replacing old equipment with more complex systems. These systems now require twice as many checks to maintain; therefore, this addition is required to accommodate added functions due to this increase in equipment. Requested addition will satisfy the full requirement for this function.

The next item is a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facility exists that can be utilized or converted for this special purpose. This project will fulfill the total requirement for this function.

The next three items are facilities required by the civil engineer's complex to accommodate the expanded functions in support of the increased base mission. They are additions to the maintenance shop, covered storage and a storage shed. All projects are deficiencies and will satisfy the total requirement for these functions.

The next item is for an addition to the existing base warehouse. The total requirement is for 130,728 square feet, with 94,214 square feet existing, leaving a deficit of 36,514 square feet. This project will satisfy 88 percent of the requirement.

The next item requested is for bachelor officer housing. The requirement is for 123 man-spaces and while 82 man-spaces exist or are under construction, there is a deficit of 41 man-spaces. The 20 man-spaces requested in this program will still leave a deficiency.

The next item is a confinement facility. No facility exists that can be utilized or converted for this function. Presently, temporary confinement of prisoners is accomplished in part of the air police headquarters building. However, this space is urgently needed for air police security and law-enforcement administration and operations. Establishment of this facility at Minot will satisfy the total requirement at this base in addition to providing a facility for the consolidation of prisoners from the other Air Force installations in the surrounding geographical area.

The next item is for an addition to the commissary store. A commissary store is required to be in an accessible location for the purchase of foodstuffs by personnel living in Government onbase family housing. There will soon be over 1,200 families who will occupy onbase housing. Minot AFB is located in an area that is subject to hazardous driving conditions during the 7 months of severe winter and the base is located approximately 14 miles from Minot. Distance from adequate facilities, together with hazardous winter driving makes it necessary that the existing inadequate store be enlarged so that all families living on base can be accommodated. The total requirement is for 18,910 square feet, while 11,168 square feet exists, leaving a deficit of 7,742 square feet which is being requested.

The next item is an addition to the officers' open mess. The total requirement is for 14,000 square feet, of which 6,625 square feet is existing, leaving a 7,375-square-foot deficit. The requested project will fullfill the total requirement. The present facility is overcrowded and there are no other facilities on base to meet this requirement.

The next item is for an addition to the gymnasium which is required to provide sufficient space for the conduct of physical conditioning and sports so essential at northern bases, experiencing long periods of inclement weather. The requested addition will fulfill the total requirement for gymnasium facilities.

The next item is an addition to the central heating plant in lieu of using individual plants in each building. The total capacity required is 4,600 horsepower, of which 3,350 horsepower is existing or under construction, leaving a deficit of 1,250 horsepower which will be wholly satisfied by the construction of this project.

The last item requested will provide additional water supply storage to support the increase in manning and provide backup storage for fire prevention. The total requirement for water storage is for 1,858,000 gallons, of which 900,000 gallons exists or is under construction, leaving a deficit of 958,000 gallons. The requested project will provide the base with approximately 70 percent of their total requirement. Without this project the base will have less than 50 percent of the required storage available.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Communications, base	Kurke Associates	$2.9	30
Lighting R/W NGCL	District engineer	17.5	0
Maintenance dock, large A/C	do	12.0	75
Shop, refueling vehicle	Kurke Associates	7.0	30
Shop arm and elect	do	9.0	30
Lab prec meas equip	do	3.5	30
IE maintenance shop	do	6.5	30
IE storage, covered	do	7.0	30
IE storage, shed	District engineer	5.0	30
Whse, sup, and equip base	Kurke Associates	12.0	0
OQ, men	do	15.0	23
Confinement facility	do	7.0	30
Store, commissary	do	12.8	0
Open mess, officer	District engineer	11.0	20
Rctn, gymnasium	Kurke Associates	9.0	23
Heating, plant	do	36.0	30
Water supply storage	District engineer	5.0	100

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	OTIS AFB	GOVT LEASED	19,858
DIR TO TOWN	7 MI SSW FALMOUTH	GOVT OWNED	1,146
COUNTY, STATE	BARNSTABLE, MASS.	OTHER ACRES	286
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	21,290
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1940
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ	REACT	1947
	AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC)		
	MED AIR REFUEL SQ (SAC)		
	3 AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING & CONTROL SQS		
	USAF HOSPITAL		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
914	56	5463	235	6668		568

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
116,000	74,758	34,843	6,399	209	6,190

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
SHOP GRND POW.EQ.	173		149	24,515	2,200	22,315	8,600	SF	169 R
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP	179		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	40
									209

Otis Air Force Base

Otis Air Force Base is located approximately 7 miles northeast of Falmouth, Mass. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, an air defense missile mission, three airborne early warning and control squadrons and Strategic Air Command tanker mission.

The program being requested for Otis totals $209,000 and consists of the following two items:

The first item is for a ground-powered equipment shop. This shop is essential for the maintenance and repair of approximately 367 pieces of ground-powered equipment required to support the fighter interceptor and SAC air refueling squadrons. Currently this function is being performed on an interim basis in three separate buildings, totaling 9,150 square feet. 2,200 square feet of hangar floor space in building 158 is being utilized; however, due to its high-ceiling open-bay construction, it does not have adequate heat or lighting. In addition, two old temporary buildings totaling 6,950 square feet are being utilized. These temporary buildings will be razed upon construction of the new facility and the existing hangar area will be utilized to satisfy a part of the covered storage requirement for this expensive and complicated equipment. Requested facility will fulfill approximately 50 percent of the total requirement for this function. It will provide an increase in combat effectiveness through improved facilities and increased efficiency of operation.

The last item is a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facilities are available that can be utilized for this special purpose. Requested item will meet the total requirement for this facility.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Shop grnd pow. eq	Hillman & Wilson	$6.0	70
Lab prec meas equip	Unknown	2.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	OXNARD AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	2 MI E CAMARILLO	GOVT OWNED	773
COUNTY, STATE	VENTURA, CALIF.	OTHER ACRES	664
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1437
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1943
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ	REACT	1951

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
124	10	962	15	1111		143

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
22,000	12,381	3,131	6,488	987	5,501

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING,APPROACH	DFRP	449		149	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	218
SHLTR,A/C,WEAPON CAL		20		NEW	3,745		3,745	1,920	SF	48
SHOP ARM&ELEC, BASE	MOD	23		NEW	4,828	4,828			LS	150
CHAPEL,W/ANNEX		25		NEW	6,080		6,080	6,080	SF	100
LAND EASEMENT CLEAR		455		NEW				290,000	AC	434
LAND,EASE,REST		456		149				15,000	AC	37
										987

Oxnard Air Force Base

Oxnard Air Force Base is located approximately 2 miles west of Camarillo, Calif. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission.

The program being requested contains $987,000 for facilities at Oxnard AFB, consisting of the following its:

The first item requested is for replacement of the existing 1,000 feet of approach lighting with 3,000 feet of the U.S. national standard lighting including threshold lights and roll bars. This lighting is essential for the safe and efficient operation of the high-performance century series jet aircraft assigned to this base. The existing lighting cannot be incorporated into the new system, nor adapted for utilization by modern-type aircraft. It will, therefore, be removed. This project will fulfill the total requirement for this facility.

The next item provides for an aircraft weapons calibration shelter needed to properly maintain the fire control systems on assigned fighter interceptor aircraft. No facilities are available that can be utilized for this special purpose. This item will satisfy 50 percent of the total requirement.

The next item involves modification of an existing hangar for an armament and electronics shop to maintain and repair all airborne equipment and accessories used in fighter interceptor aircraft. Space presently being utilized is 4,828 square feet in a shop lean-to to the field maintenance hangar. This lean-to furnishes only about 30 percent of the required space and does not provide the environment essential to maintenance of electronic equipment. The requirement for armament and electronics shop is 12,650 square feet. This item will fulfill the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is for a 150-seat chapel with annex. Limited services are presently being held in a small 1,000-square-foot supply room which is totally inadequate and cannot fulfill the religious program requirements at this base. Adjacent community religious facilities cannot handle the additional military load. With the recent completion and occupancy of family housing, the need for this facility has increased. Upon completion of this project, the presently utilized space will revert to its intended use as a supply room. The requested item will satisfy 75 percent of the chapel requirement at Oxnard.

The next item requested in this program is for the acquisition of clearance easements over the land in the approach zone at the west end of the runway to preclude erection of oil-drilling rigs in this critical area.

The last item requested is for the acquisition of restrictive easement, over that required for the installation of the approach lighting system.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting, approach	Porter, Urquhart, McCreary & O'Brien.	$20.4	70
Shltr, A/C, weapon cal	Unknown	3.5	5
Shop arm and elec, base	do	5.5	5
Chapel, w/annex	do	7.8	3
Land easement clear	District engineer	0	0
Land, ease, rent	do	0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	PAINE AFB	GOVT LEASED	201
DIR TO TOWN	6 MI NNE EVERETT	GOVT OWNED	381
COUNTY, STATE	SNOHOMISH, WASH.	OTHER ACRES	350
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	932
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1942
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ REACT		1951
	AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC)		
	TRP CARR SQ (MED) (RES)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
141	10	1146	15	1312		255

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
26,000	10,694	6,554	8,752	1,976	6,776

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
APRON,OPERATIONAL	ADDN	443		NEW	23,244	14,244	9,000	9,000	SY	193
LIGHTING,APPROACH		66		NEW	3,000		3,000	3,000	FT	439
AIRCRAFT SHELTER,REA		12		NEW	5		5	4	EA	670
SHLTR,A/C,WEAPON CAL		14		NEW	11,505		11,505	6,140	SF	250
SHOP,GRND POWRD EQIP		16		NEW	11,320		11,320	4,574	SF	138
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		180		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	40
RCTN,GYMNASIUM		522		NEW	10,600		10,600	10,600	SF	246
										1,976

PAINE AIR FORCE BASE

Paine Air Force Base is located 6 miles southwest of Everett, Wash. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, and a reserve troop carrier mission.

The total program being requested amounts to $1,976,000 and consists of the following seven items:

The first item requested is additional operational apron to relieve congested, inadequate parking space and to improve operational efficiency.

The next item is for approach lighting on the north end of the primary instrument runway. Approach lighting is required to provide a means of accurate runway orientation for pilots during the critical period in which they transition from instrument approach to visual landing under minimum ceilings and visibility. The proposed facility will provide the pilots with a means for identification of the runway center line and threshold location under low visibility conditions. Due to its location, Paine Air Force Base has a great deal of precipitation and IFR weather. This project will provide the best available approach lighting system and allow aircraft the maximum safety margin they need to operate during severe weather conditions. The existing 1,000 feet of lighting is inadequate for high-speed jet fighter aircraft.

The next item requested will provide shelters for combat ready fighter interceptor aircraft. Shelters make it possible for an ADC fighter squadron to maintain a high in-commission rate during periods of adverse weather. Need for these shelters is emphasized in ADC by the urgency of scrambles and the necessity for rapid turnaround of aircraft. Requested project will fulfill the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is for an aircraft weapons calibration shelter needed to perform scheduled and unscheduled boresighting and harmonization of installed fixed fire control systems on assigned fighter aircraft. No facilities are avaialble that can be used or converted for this special purpose. Request will satisfy 50 percent of the total requirements.

The next item is a ground-powered equipment shop which is required for the maintenance and repair of approximately 156 pieces of equipment. Currently, maintenance requirements are being partially met by use of a small, 1,248-square-foot wooden building which is on temporary loan from the Air Force Reserve unit, most maintenance is performed out of doors. This is an unsatisfactory operation in every respect. The annual average of 192 days of rain compounds the problem of out-of-doors maintenance and increases the malfunction rate. The availability of reliable ground-powered equipment has a direct effect on the operational capability of the tactical unit. This item will satisfy approximately 50 percent of the total requirement for ground-powered equipment facilities.

The next item is for a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facility exists that can be used or converted for this purpose. This project will fulfill the total requirement for this item.

The last item is for a gymnasium to maintain and promote the physical conditioning and well-being of assigned military personnel. This project is necessary to provide minimum indoor recreational facilities for a base located in an area dominated by inclement weather. Long rainy seasons limit outdoor activities to a small portion of the year. No facility or building exists that can be used or converted into a gymnasium. The only present indoor recreational facility consists of a four-lane bowling alley. The requested item will fulfill the total requirements for a gymnasium.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Apron, operational	District Engineer	$10.0	0
Lighting, approach	do	21.0	3
Aircraft shelter, rea	Unknown	20.0	0
Shltr, A/C, weapon cal	do	7.5	0
Shop, grnd powrd equip	do	5.0	0
Lab prec meas equip	do	2.0	0
Rctn, gymnasium	do	7.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	RICHARDS-GEBAUR AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	1 MI SSE BELTON	GOVT OWNED	1,928
COUNTY, STATE	JACKSON-CASS, MO.	OTHER ACRES	47
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	1,975
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1944
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ REACT		1954
	KANSAS CITY AIR DEF SECTOR HQ (SAGE DC)		
	AIR DIV HQ (SAGE CC)		
	2 MED TRP CARR SQS (RES)		
	AIR RES (NAV TRNG) (RES)		
	AIR DEF GP (SAGE)		
	(SAGE PROGRAMMING)		
	USAF HOSPITAL		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
498	69	2409	181	3157		797

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
57,000	29,225	22,215	5,560	240	5,320

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING,APPROACH	ADDN	164		NEW	3,000	2,400	600	600	FT	91
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		181		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	40
IE,MAINTENANCE SHOP	ADDN	510		NEW	11,800	5,600	6,200	6,200	SF	109
										240

510

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base is located 1 mile northwest of Belton, Mo. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission, an air defense sector and division headquarters; and a Reserve troop carrier and navigational training mission of the Continental Air Command.

The total program being requested amounts to $240,000 and includes the following three items:

The first item is for an addition to the approach lighting system. The requirement for approach lighting is 3,000 feet. Existing or under construction totals 2,400 feet, leaving a deficiency of 600 feet. The requested project will satisfy the total requirement for this facility. Approach lighting is necessary to provide a means of accurate runway orientation for pilots during the critical period in which they transition from instrument approach to visual landing conditions under minimum ceilings and visibility.

The next item is for a precision measurement equipment laboratory. No facility exists that can be used or converted for this purpose. Requested project will fulfill the total requirement for this facility.

The last item is for an addition to the civil engineers' maintenance shop. The total requirement is for 11,800 square feet, of which 5,600 square feet is existing, leaving a deficit of 6,200 square feet which is requested in this program. Base expansion, since the original shop was constructed, makes the existing facility totally inadequate and this addition necessary.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting, approach	Burns & McDonnell Engineering Co.	$4.5	0
Lab prec meas equip	do	2.0	30
IE, maintenance shop	do	3.5	30

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	SELFRIDGE AFB	GOVT LEASED	7
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI SW MT CLEMENS	GOVT OWNED	3,060
COUNTY, STATE	MACOMB, MICH.	OTHER ACRES	163
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	3,230
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1917
PRINCIPAL MISSION	2 FTR INTERCEPTOR SQS REACT		1922
	2 MED AIR REFUEL SQS (SAC)		
	AIR RESCUE SQ (RES)		
	AIR RES (NAV TRNG) SQ (RES)		
	MED TRP CARR SQ (RES)		
	10th AF HQ (CNC)		
	USAF HOSPITAL		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
887	10	4741	15	5653		753

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
67,000	25,096	26,902	15,002	5,177	9,825

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING APPROACH		497		NEW	4,500	3,000	1,500	1,500	FT	157
LIGHTING R/W NGCL		167		NEW	A/R		LS		LS	367
SHOP A/C ENG I&R		529	SAC	149	16,600	3,800	12,800	12,800	SF	252
SHOP,ARM&ELECT,BASE	DFRP	170		NEW	12,650		12,650	12,650	SF	375
COMP.MED.FAC.	DFRP	187		161	75,200		75,200	75,200	SF	3,542
SERVICE CLUB	DFRP	193		NEW	27,800		27,800	19,800	SF	484
										5,177

SELFRIDGE AIR FORCE BASE

Selfridge Air Force Base is located approximately 3 miles northwest of Mount Clemens, Mich. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter-interceptor mission, a Strategic Air Command tanker mission, and the following Continental Air Command missions: 10th AF Headquarters, a Reserve air rescue squadron, a Reserve navigational training squadron, and a Reserve troop carrier squadron.

The total program being requested amounts to $5,177,000 and consists of the following items:

The first item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of U.S. national standard approach lighting at the secondary (south) end of the primary instrument runway. This lighting is essential for the safe and efficient operation of the high performance jet aircraft assigned to this base. More than 35 percent of all aircraft landings use this runway approach.

The next item is narrow gage and centerline runway lighting which is one of the essential components of an integrated approach and landing system required at bases chosen as an area "safe haven" for recovery of aircraft during periods of extremely adverse weather conditions. This lighting consists of a system of high intensity lights embedded 30 feet from and parallel to the centerline of the runway for the first 3,200 feet of the landing zone. From this point, smaller lights are embedded at regular intervals along the runway centerline for the remainder of the runway to allow for accurate directional control and normal deceleration. The requested item will fulfill the total requirement for this special facility.

The next item is an aircraft engine inspection repair shop to support the SAC tanker mission. The total requirement is for 16,600 square feet; while 3,800 square feet exists, a deficit of 12,800 square feet exists. Requested project will satisfy the requirement for this facility.

The next item is an armament and electronic shop which is needed to maintain and repair the delicate electronic equipment and accessories used in fighter-interceptor aircraft assigned to this base. Presently, maintenance is being performed on an interim basis in an existing inadequate temporary building of 2,740 square feet. Upon completion of this project it will be used as a flight line maintenance control shop. The total requirement for armament and electronics shop is 12,650 square feet. The requested project will satisfy this requirement.

The next item is for the construction of a composite medical facility with 100 beds. The existing hospital consists of 13 buildings constructed in a heterogeneous manner. A remaining small permanent structure was constructed in 1929 without pipe ducts or crawl space resulting in costly and difficult repairs. Twelve of these buildings are cantonment-type structures built between 1937 and 1943. All these buildings show evidence of wood rot and termite infestation. If a new hospital is not provided, the present outmoded, dilapidated structures will require extensive rehabilitation. Further, the existing hospital would require a new addition to correct the space deficiency. It is economically impracticable to provide any adequate medical facility by rehabilitating the temporary buildings and constructing an addition in excess of the total square footage of the existing medical plant. Upon completion of the new facility the cantonment-type structures will be demolished and the small permanent buildings will be utilized for administrative space. This hospital is the only military hospital in the Detroit area.

The last item is a service club. The existing service club of 7,028 square feet is an interim facility in a temporary messhall constructed in 1942 with a proposed life of 10 years, which has deteriorated beyond economical repair. It will be razed to make space for the new club. The total requirement for service club is 27,800 square feet, the requested 19,800 square feet will fulfill approximately 70 percent of the requirement.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	District engineer	$5.0	0
Lighting P/W NGCL	do	10.0	0
Shop A/C eng I and R	do	12.5	100
Shop, arm and elect, base	do	13.0	100
Comp. med. fac	Unknown	150.0	0
Service club	do	13.0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	SUFFOLK CO AFB	GOVT LEASED	1,659
DIR TO TOWN	3 MI SW WESTHAMPTON BEACH	GOVT OWNED	119
COUNTY, STATE	SUFFOLK, N. Y.	OTHER ACRES	768
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	2,546
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	FTR INTERCEPTOR SQ	REACT	1951
	AIR DEF MSLE SQ (BOMARC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	TOTAL MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
138	6	1285	10	1439		162

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
37,000	10,853	20,583	5,564	505	5,059

PROJECT TITLE	PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
LIGHTING APPROACH MOD ADDN	448		149	3,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	FT	68
SHLTR,A/C,WEAPON CAL	21		NEW	11,505		11,505	6,140	SF	161
SHOP,ARM&ELECT,BASE MOD	24		NEW	12,650		12,650		LS	150
TRLR,CT,PARKING	518		NEW	100		100	50	TR	100
LAND,FEE,PURCH	454		149				10,000	AC	26
									505

Suffolk County Air Force Base

Suffolk County Air Force Base is located 3 miles northeast of Westhampton Beach, N.Y. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command fighter interceptor mission and an air defense missile mission.

The program request contains $505,000 for Suffolk County and consists of five items.

The first item is for the installation of 1,500 feet of additional approach lighting and modification of the existing lighting system to provide a facility that conforms to the U.S. national standard approach lighting system. This lighting is essential for the safe and efficient operation of high performance century series jet aircraft assigned to this base.

The next item is for an aircraft weapons calibration shelter. This facility is needed so that harmonization of installed fire control systems on assigned fighter aircraft can be made. No facilities exist that can be used or converted for this purpose. This item will fulfill 50 percent of the requirement for this item.

The next item involves modification of an existing hangar for an armament and electronics shop to maintain and repair all airborne equipment and accessories used in fighter interceptor aircraft. This activity is now being accomplished in the limited space of 8,993 square feet in four substandard buildings. This arrangement is inefficient and inadequate. The requirement for armament and electronics shop is 12,650 square feet. This item will fulfill the total requirement for this facility and will obviate the necessity of construction of a new building for the purpose intended.

The next item requested is a trailer court to accommodate the individually owned trailers of assigned military personnel. This base is located in a semi-isolated resort area catering to summer tourists. As a consequence, existing trailer parts in the community are underdeveloped, of a temporary nature, costly, inadequate, deficient in minimum health standards and below minimum Air Force standards. Existing housing does not fulfill the total family housing requirement for assigned personnel. This item will provide approximately 50 percent of the total requirement for trailers.

The last item requested is for the acquisition of the land necessary to support the approach lighting project requested as the first item.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Lighting approach	Gabriel, Galperin & Associates	$7.5	100
Shltr, A/C weapon cal	do	4.5	0
Shop, arm. and elec., base	do	8.5	18
Trlr. ct. parking	do	6.0	18
Land, fee purch	District engineer	0	0

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
FY – 1961
APPROPRIATION MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

STATION	TYNDALL AFB	GOVT LEASED	
DIR TO TOWN	7 MI NW PANAMA CITY	GOVT OWNED	29,557
COUNTY, STATE	BAY, FLORIDA	OTHER ACRES	57
COUNTRY		TOTAL ACRES	29,614
COMMAND	ADC		
		DATE OCC	1941
PRINCIPAL MISSION	WPNS EMPLOYMENT CTR TEST (WPNS) SQ DRONE SQ AIR DEF SQ (WPNS) AIR DIV HQ AIR DEF INTERCEPTOR WPNS SYSTEM SQ USAF INTERCEPTOR WPNS SCHOOL USAF ACFT CONTROLLER SCHOOL (ATC)		

OFFICERS		AIRMEN		TOTAL MILITARY	CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT		NATIONALS	DAF
685	946	4843	753	7,227		896

EST TOTAL COST (000)	ASSETS AS OF 30 JUNE 59 (000)	FUNDED CONSTR NOT IN INVENTORY (000)	BALANCE REQUIRED (000)	FY 1961 REQUEST (000)	FUTURE YEARS (000)
67,000	46,254	9,861	10,885	1,297	9,588

PROJECT TITLE		PRIORITY	TENANT COMD	AUTH P.L.	QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
					TOTAL REQUIRED	FINANCED	UNFINANCED	QUANTITY	UNIT	AMOUNT (000)
PAD,POWER CHECK		161		NEW	3,168		3,168	2,012	SY	198
PERSONAL EQUIPMENT	DFRP	499		NEW	18,744		18,744	18,744	SF	453
SQUADRON OPERATIONS		500		NEW	65,670	52,170	13,500	13,500	SF	250
SHOP,GRND POWRD EQIP	DFRP	506		NEW	13,000		13,000	13,000	SF	269
LAB PREC MEAS EQUIP		182		NEW	1,650		1,650	1,650	SF	40
SEWAGE,TREMT&DISP	ADDN	525		NEW	990	660	330	330	TD	62
SAN,SEW, PUMP STA		526		149	A/R		LS		LS	25
										1,297

Tyndall Air Force Base

Tyndall Air Force Base is located approximately 7 miles southeast of Panama City, Fla. The planned use of this base is for an Air Defense Command Weapons Employment Center.

The program requested for Tyndall amounts to $1,297,000, which consists of the following items:

The first item is for a power check pad to be used while performing full power engine check. The pad previously used had to be removed in order to construct the access taxiway which supports the runway extension which is under construction. This facility will be utilized to support approximately 200 century series and supporting aircraft assigned to this base.

The next item requested is for a personal flight equipment building which is needed to provide a consolidated facility for the issue, inspection, maintenance and replacement of all high altitude pressure suits. This facility will care for equipment valued at approximately $2 million. The temporary building now being used as an interim facility will be razed when the requested facility is constructed. This item will fulfill the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is to provide adequate operation space for three TDY squadrons deployed to Tyndall for missile and rocket firing. Functions are presently housed in tents, trailers and line shacks placed along a highly congested flight line.

The next item is for a ground-powered equipment shop to support approximately 466 pieces of equipment. Present facility is a small, badly deteriorated temporary building of World War II vintage that will be razed upon completion of this project. The requested project will satisfy the total requirement for this facility.

The next item is for a precision measurement equipment laboratory.

The last two items requested in this program are to increase the capacity of the existing sewage treatment and disposal plant to process the additional sewage resulting from increase in personnel and provide additional sewage pumping stations to convey the sewage to the treatment plant.

Design information

Line item	Name of architect-engineer or district engineer	Cost of design (thousands)	Percent completed
Pad, power check	District engineer	$6.0	75
Personal equipment	do	20.0	5
Squadron operations	do	8.5	5
Shop, grnd. powrd. equip	do	12.5	0
Lab. prec. meas. equip	do	1.5	0
Sewage, treat. and disp.	do	2.6	50
San. sew. pump sta.	do	.5	50

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Mr. Sheppard. General Curtin, we will insert your statement in the record at this point.

(Information referred to follows:)

Air Defense Command

All of the bases listed under Air Defense Command are in the proposed Norad deployment of fighter iterceptors under the revised air defense plan. The Air Force is reviewing the details of the Norad planned deployment. At the present time, facilities proposed for the 16 ADC bases listed in the fiscal year 1961 MCP are considered valid requirements. While there may be some minor revisions as the total plan is finalized the major current problem is considered to be the additional requirements for the adjusted fighter interceptors.

Installation and appropriation request

[In thousands of dollars]

Duluth Municipal Airport	197	Otis AFB	209
Geiger Field	456	Oxnard AFB	987
Grand Forks AFB	2,699	Paine Field	1,976
Hamilton AFB	579	Richards Gebaur AFB	240
K. I. Sawyer Airport	3,422	Selfridge AFB	5,177
Kincheloe AFB	4,783	Suffolk County AFB	505
Kingsley Field	436	Tyndall AFB	1,297
McChord AFB	1,111		
Minot AFB	4,130	Total	28,204

COST INCREASES

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have major increases in the total estimated cost at several of the bases. List these increases for the record and explain to the committee the reason for the increases.

General CURTIN. We will do so, sir.

Colonel PARKHILL. At Geiger the estimated total cost was increased because we added $4 million for family housing. You will recall we discussed this the other day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is an additive but not cost of construction as such?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is right.

Mr. GIBBENS. What we have done is to go back and look at the inventories as of July 1, 1959, and from there start with a good base. Inventories show cost to the Government rather than the actual value at the time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask the same question with regard to Grand Forks.

Colonel PARKHILL. We added $24 million for family housing assets and refined our inventory costs.

At added family housing assets in the amount of $14 million.

At Minot Air Force Base we added $21 million for family housing assets, refined our inventory costs, and reduced our estimate of future requirements.

GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. In detail will you pick up Grand Forks as shown on page 71?

Last year Congress funded the armament and electronics shop for this facility. Why are you back for additional space this year before the other is completed?

Colonel PARKHILL. This item is for support of the SAC bomber and tanker mission. When we programed the original building, 12,400 square feet, it was felt that that would satisfy the requirements. However, during last year we experienced many modifications to the B–52 armament and electronic equipment. These modifications have replaced many of the old equipments with more sophisticated systems and this has generated an additional maintenance load. We are proposing to add 4,650 square feet to this building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it is based on additional workload requirements within the area. Is that correct?

General CURTIN. Additional experience because of the aircraft modification.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for NCO mess and gymnasium at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. The base was originally built for one fighter squadron, and we built a small club which in terms of the new population is about half the requirement, so we propose to add the other half for the NCO open mess.

For the gymnasium we have an existing gymnasium of 10,500 square feet. We are proposing to add to that 6,016 square feet to provide additional physical conditioning facilities for the SAC combat crews.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the water supply situation at this base?

Colonel PARKHILL. We need an additional 861,000 gallons per day. The city of Grand Forks can supply the water, but to get the increased flow it is necessary for us to put a pumping station on our 16-inch line which runs from the city to the base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are using a booster to pick up the excess load?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for confinement facilities at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have no confinement facility. We are presently borrowing administrative space from the Air Police Unit.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, gentlemen?

Mr. SIKES. You were planning to close some B–47 bases which have substantially the same facilities you need for this base. Why would you plan to close one installation and build up others?

Colonel LILES. Does this apply to Grand Forks?

Mr. SIKES. To any base where this same situation pertains. I am concerned by the fact that the Air Force is proposing to close some of its installations, including some B–47 bases, and yet instead of using those facilities you propose to build up at this point. It does not sound good from the standpoint of the taxpayer. Tell me what the situation is.

Colonel LILES. I believe this base served the SAC mission for the B–52 and also the KC–131.

Mr. SIKES. I know it does, but why are you building up this one and closing another?

Colonel LILES. As far as the tanker mission is concerned we needed to get the tankers north for operational reasons.

Mr. SIKES. How much of this new requirement of $2,700,000 is for tankers and would be necessary if some of the other activity were carried on in bases you have scheduled for closing?

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, we originally went into this base back in the 1957 program to actually make the conversion. At that time the selection was made for the northern bases for the newer SAC weapons.

The big money was programed back in 1957, for example, $18 million.

Following that we have had smaller increments until now we have just more or less the completion of the project.

Mr. SIKES. I realize you have spent a lot of money there but that does not answer my question. Why can you not utilize a base you are planning to close for some activities which you seek to concentrate here in order to avoid this expenditure and future expenditures of this type?

General CURTIN. As far as facilities are concerned, Mr. Sikes, to take a B–47 base and convert it to a KC–131 and B–52 use——

Mr. SIKES. I am not talking about that. I concede you want the tankers as far north as possible. There is some advantage in having the B–52's there but it is not quite essential.

If you could save several millions of dollars for the people who pay the bills I should think you would want to do that, and I know they would welcome it.

General CURTIN. Going back to Colonel Parkhill's point, sir, the heavy construction for the conversion to the B–52 use already is well along. Actual cost of converting a B–47 base, minimum cost, to B–52 use, has been running on the order of $6 to $8 million. This is largely just for the pavements.

Here the items that could be divided out, KC–135 versus B–52, would be the corrosion control facility and the maintenance docks, which are used by both types of aircraft.

The remaining items in this program are essentially support items for the base and would be not totally required but certainly would be most desirable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At K. I. Sawyer last year Congress funded an armament and electronics shop for this facility. Why do you need one this year?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is the same reason I gave before, sir, the added workload due to the modifications to the armament electronic equipment of the B–52.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for various headquarters space at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. The present airbase group headquarters building was constructed for the fighter interceptor squadron. To take care of the new mission we are proposing to add a 10,022 square foot addition to the building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What kind of a chapel are you building at a cost of $32 per square foot and why?

Colonel EDMONDS. As far as I know it is a standard type chapel. Since this is an addition there is a requirement for alteration of plumbing for $8,400, electrical $20,700 and heating $12,200. The general construction cost to the 5-foot line is only $80,300 or $21.13 per square foot.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What type of commissary do you have at this installation at the present time and how many hours per day and per week is it open for the actual purchase of commissary supplies?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have a standard small commissionary of 7,589 square feet built for the fighter intercepter squadron. We require an additional 10,000 square feet.

The present commissary is open an average of 6½ hours per day for 6 days a week.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you close those commissaries do you close them during the middle of the day?

Colonel URBACH. The schedule for K. I. Sawyer is Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday the store is open from 11:30 in the morning until 5:30 in the afternoon. On Saturday it is open from 9 until 12 and it is closed on Thursdays.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the motivating factor behind this discontinuance? Is it cost factors, or time factors?

Colonel URBACH. The principal factor is manning the commissary. The base commander has to appropriate the number of spaces and dollars that he is authorized to spend and he has to take into consideration the workload at the commissary on a one-shift basis, so the commissary is open the number of hours indicated on a one-shift basis.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming that you have one period of time that it is open. Does this indicate you have to have additional staffing because of the influx concentrated within that period of time?

Colonel URBACH. The number of persons authorized to be hired in a commissary is based on a dollar sales volume. In order to provide the maximum number of hours of operation the commander has to authorize the number of hours the store is to remain open. He tries to provide the best service within the one-shift period that he can.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many commissaries do you have on the base?

Colonel URBACH. Just one, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the size of it and what is the total number of personnel working at the commisary?

(The information requested follows:)

The scope of the existing commissary at K. I. Sawyer AFB is 7,589 square feet and 17 persons are assigned to this activity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for an officers' club at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. The present club was built for the fighter interceptor squadron. It is about one-quarter of the required size. We propose an 11,262-square-foot addition.

KINCHELOE AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for headquarters facilities at Kincheloe at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. The first headquarters item would be at the bottom of page 104, "Headquarters, air police." They are presently using canvas covered huts. We propose this space for the air police and the provost marshal.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total number of personnel you contemplate housing within this structure when it is completed?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is 2,650 square feet. I would like to furnish for the record how many people that will confine.

(The information referred to follows:)

No provisions for the confinement of people are contained in the headquarters base unit air police facility being requested at Kincheloe Air Force Base.

A headquarters base unit air police building of 2,650 square feet is provided on a base where the working complement in the structure is less than 18 and the total base population is more than 2,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of the BOMARC unit at this facility?

Colonel PARKHILL. The BOMARC unit is under construction, to be operational next year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for post exchanges at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. We are using a small temporary structure which cannot be expanded due to its location. We propose to construct a new facility and use the old building for a base library.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for an officers' and NCO club at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. They are presently using a structure built as a dining hall. We propose to add 7,500 square feet to this dining hall to make a complete club.

For the NCO's the present club was built for the fighter-interceptor squadron and it is far too small. We propose an addition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the difference between the manpower requirement under the fighter squadron operation and the present demand?

Colonel PARKHILL. I will give it to you approximately, sir. It would be about a 2,200-man add-on for the new mission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will these requests meet the requirements for these facilities or do you expect to come back for more?

Colonel PARKHILL. If we have any more they will probably be related mainly to the replacement of substandard facilities. We feel this program essentially completes the basic requirements for these missions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, insofar as these requirements are concerned they will take care of the workload insofar as you can project it and further requests will be based upon obsolescence. Is that correct?

Colonel PARKHILL. That is essentially correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. SIKES. I have no questions.

Mr. LAIRD. What is the status of the BOMARC B installation there? I did not get the percentage of completion at the present time. If you don't have it here please insert it in the record.

(The information requested follows:)

The BOMARC B installation was 47 percent complete as of the 29th of February and estimated to be 65 percent complete by May 1, 1960.

Mr. SIKES. Is this principally a BOMARC B mission?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir. This is a support base for the BOMARC B. I would say this is essentially for your bombers and fighter interceptors and tankers.

Mr. SIKES. To what extent does BOMARC B enter into the new construction scheduled in this budget?

Colonel PARKHILL. There are no specific items in this listing that relate directly to the BOMARC.

Mr. SIKES. What could be eliminated by virtue of other facilities becoming available if BOMARC B is not to be placed here?

Colonel PARKHILL. I do not believe any of these could be deleted. It is possible some of them may be reduced a small amount based purely on a recomputation of square footage, but in looking these over we feel they are all essentially required even if BOMARC is not there.

Mr. SIKES. How many BOMARC B missiles did you plan to place here?

Colonel PARKHILL. Thirty in the initial increment.

Mr. SIKES. You do not need extra facilities for 30 missiles and no additional personnel?

General CURTIN. The missile launchers themselves were in a separate package program for BOMARC. The personnel that are on the support base, as Colonel Parkhill has pointed out, have been integrated in the total figures shown here for the base strengths. Technical facilities themselves are separate and apart from this.

Mr. SIKES. Are they in this budget or previous budgets?

General CURTIN. In the previous budget. Launchers are under construction now.

Mr. SIKES. When will they be ready?

Colonel PARKHILL. October of 1960. They are running about 60 percent complete. I would like to verify that.

Mr. LAIRD. 49 percent. I just got the figure.

Colonel EDMONDS. 47 percent complete as of the 29th of February.

Mr. SIKES. What will we do while we are waiting for the BOMARC B's to become operational?

General CURTIN. With the launchers, sir?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

General CURTIN. The first problem will be one of installation and checkout and calibration of the equipment. Once that is done, if the missile itself is not available, we will have to hold it on standby and maintenance until it is available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming BOMARC falls by the wayside, how can these sites be used?

General CURTIN. We have not come up with a good answer to that question, Mr. Chairman. We have thought about it. About the only recourse we would have would be to see how much we could really salvage in terms of installed equipment for other uses.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What will the total expenditure be there under the total request?

Colonel EDMONDS. $3.8 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that a complete request at the present time?

Colonel EDMONDS. That is the latest current working estimate for the entire B unit there.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is rather obvious you would not request more funds there for that specific purpose if for some reason BOMARC would not become operational. Is that correct?

General CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Your statement is that all of the items listed herein would be required whether or not BOMARC B becomes operational?

General CURTIN. That is correct with one proviso. We have run studies on other bases where we knew the missiles were not going in. As I recall, the impact on items which are typified in this program was that something like 5 to 7 percent of the scope might be affected. You recognize that the scope was sometimes in 500 to 1,000 personnel increments, so the chances are the majority of these items would not be affected, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Further questions?

Mr. LAIRD. This is one of the bases where the BOMARC B is programed. I realize there is no funding in the budget that is before us for the BOMARC B installation because those funds have been appropriated previously by this committee.

I would, however, like to ask one or two questions with regard to it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; proceed.

Mr. LAIRD. Who did the design engineering for the BOMARC missile installation at Kincheloe?

Colonel EDMONDS. I do not have that with me at this time. We can supply the information for the record.

Mr. LAIRD. Let us take McGuire. Who did it at McGuire?

General CURTIN. We do not have that list for BOMARC.

Mr. LAIRD. If you can, please give me the name of the architect-engineer and also the number of change orders issued on the installation at McGuire Air Force Base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And add the total cost of design.

(The information requested follows:)

Architect-engineer for Kincheloe: Harley, Ellington, and Day, 153 East Elizabeth Street, Detroit, Mich.

Architect-engineer for McGuire: Wigton-Abbott, Newark, N.J.

Changes at McGuire numbered 40 at total cost of $2,346,869. Changes were numerous and expensive because this was the first BOMARC site and the facilities were being built while the missile was still under development. Changes in construction were necessary to assure compatibility with the weapon system.

It is estimated that if the current BOMARC B program is canceled by May 1, 1960, a total of approximately $11.5 million could be recouped in military construction funds.

Colonel EDMONDS. We furnished a report of the total number of change orders but we will add that to the information, too.

Mr. LAIRD. I understood there was a large number there. It seemed to me an awful lot of changes were made after you put a job out for bid.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are these changes specified for BOMARC B or other items?

Colonel EDMONDS. We will check that, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. See that they are set forth so we can evaluate one versus the other, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, Mr. Chairman. That is all I had.

KINGSLEY FIELD

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for a commissary at Kingsley at the present time and how many hours per day and per week is this open for actual purchase of food, et cetera?

Colonel PARKHILL. We are presently using a small temporary structure which we propose to replace. The commissary is operating 6½ hours per day, 6 days per week.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The same explanation for the time open pertains as to the one previously testified to?

Colonel PARKHILL. Yes, sir.

MINOT AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for the officers' club at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. This is another base which was built originally for a fighter interceptor squadron and it started with the 1955 program. It has been progressively built up for the SAC bomber and tanker mission.

We built an officers' club for the fighter interceptor squadron. We propose now to add to that to take care of the new total requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Indicate in your response the amount of personnel involved which creates this condition.

(The information requested follows:)

Since the existing officers' open mess at Minot Air Force Base was approved, the total base population has been increased by over 3,000 additional personnel. The officer population alone has been increased by over 400 officers since the initial increment of the club was constructed. This major increase critically overtaxes the small existing facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for a gymnasium?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have here a 10,830-square foot standard gymnasium which was built at the time the fighter interceptor squadron went in there. We are proposing to add 5,770 square feet to provide for the additional load of the SAC combat crews.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Add the same explanation for manpower as you gave in the first instance.

(The information requested follows:)

Since the existing base gymnasium at Minot Air Force Base was approved, the total base population has been increased by over 3,000 additional personnel. With respect to the addition for the gymnasium, the total base population, the major portion of which consists of combat crews, has more than quadrupled. The requested addition will provide exercise, steam, and massage rooms to promote the physical conditioning and well-being of these vital personnel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year Congress funded an addition to the heating plant. When will we terminate this requirement?

Colonel PARKHILL. This addition of 1,250 horsepower on top of the 670 horsepower requested last year is designed to provide for the items in last year's and this year's program. This should complete it.

OXNARD AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for armament electronics shop at shop at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. We are using a lean-to to a hangar which provides about one-third of the required space.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the land where you are requesting easements at a cost of $1,500 per acre?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have two items, one for easement clearance, 290 acres at $1,500 per acre, which is agricultural truck farming land.

Colonel EDMONDS. 290 acres, is it not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. State the nature of the land, the easement, and also the correct cost per acre, please.

(The information requested follows:)

The 290 acres of easements is located in the west approach zone to the east/west runway. The highest and best use of this land is: (*a*) Surface—agriculture (truck farming) with a small element of possible future development for housing units; (*b*) subsurface—proven oil production. The principal danger of encroachment in the approach zone is from oil drilling operations. The proven oil production accounts for the estimated cost of approximately $1,500 per acre for easements restricting drilling in the approach zone.

Standard Oil Co. and Lloyd Corp. are the two companies that have been doing drilling in the area involved.

Mr. GIBBENS. Mr. Chairman, the land for which we are getting the easement clearance at Oxnard is land which is underlain with oil. We have had difficulty in the past keeping drilling rigs from coming within the flight path. It has been so expensive that we have tried various means of trying to keep the rigs out other than buying the easement. We had a working agreement——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who is the company you are doing business with there, please?

Mr. GIBBENS. I cannot remember offhand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you are dealing with easements projected out this distance, there is not any reason why they cannot do an offset job on those wells. You are buying only surface rights, anyway, are you not?

Mr. GIBBENS. We are buying rights over the surface which would preclude their erecting obstacles within our flight path.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is true, but that does not obviate the fact that an oil company can whipstock and go right straight under your runway if they see fit to do that. How far do you want them away from the side of your runway as compared to the end of the runway? What are your requirements there from a technical point of view?

Mr. GIBBENS. It would be an increasing hazard as we leave the runway on a takeoff or landing. I am going back a couple of years now. As I said, we did have an agreement with one company, the name of which I do not remember, to have some rights in here to do drilling. However, the field is proving out fairly well and we anticipate other companies coming in. We have no assurance that we can make such agreements with the other companies.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as your actual control of the operations of the oil companies, you can control them only up to the point that you yourself buy your easement unless you can get a rezoning.

Mr. GIBBENS. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you want to keep them away from the end of your overrun, as it were, that is one thing. If they want to whipstock in and go under there because of oil deposits, what control do you have over that, if any?

Mr. GIBBENS. We would have no control, and I do not think we would care to have any control. All we want to do is to preclude their building structures in the flight path.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are doing that by the amount of land you are utilizing at the head of your runway for easement purposes, are you not?

Mr. GIBBENS. We are doing that by requesting this easement that we have in the program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That will take care of it insofar as any standard drilling?

Mr. GIBBENS. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as immediately adjacent to the runway, at the side—assuming this is the easement, if they want to come up here they can do that?

Mr. GIBBENS. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. When you offset drill that way, does it constitute any hazard to surface structures above when the oil is removed?

Mr. GIBBENS. I would presume not, sir. We would have no structures of any consequence in this area.

Mr. JONAS. We have had a little different experience at Long Beach.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is not an operational requirement. It is purely for the purpose of precluding any structures being put in the way so when the planes are setting down or taking off, they are not running into structures or have to attain unnecessary elevation.

General CURTIN. These superstructures are penetrating the flight path.

Mr. JONAS. I was thinking about the situation that might result several years hence if they remove a lot of oil. If you have only surface rights and they have the right to offset drill under those rights, we may have cave-ins such as we had at Long Beach.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the proximity of the easements to the ocean front at Oxnard? Can anybody here tell me?

Mr. GIBBENS. 5½ miles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the general topography? Do you have rolling conditions, or is it flat?

Colonel LUCAS. Sir, the topography there is flat. In fact, it is mostly orchard, agricultural. There is a very slight gradation from the easement to the ocean front.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As long as we are on that topic, what is the general situation within the Air Force in the procurement of land for base purposes, easement purposes, or other operational requirements when you obtain only the surface rights and an oil company wants to whipstock under you in order to drain a basin, assuming you may be near the crown of said basin? What are the general contract procedures? Do you try to prohibit whipstocking, or do you not?

General CURTIN. No, sir. It is a somewhat cooperative venture between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior. We, working with the Department of the Interior, try to determine whether the development of these fields is in the national interest, what natural resources they might contribute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Department of the Interior would have control only if they actually owned the land. If it is privately owned, it is a different picture.

General CURTIN. Unless we happened in some cases to own the mineral rights as well as the surface rights. If we own the mineral rights, then normally we transfer those to the Department of the Interior for administration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you own the mineral rights under this particular base?

General CURTIN. I cannot answer your question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert that in the record, will you, please?

(The information requested follows:)

The landowners retained the mineral rights in the land comprising the main base; however, these rights were subrogated, i.e., the owners cannot develop or extract the minerals by any method which will disturb the surface or interfere with operations on the surface.

This 15 acres of easements is located at the west end of the present east-west runway. The area is highly developed and productive for truck farming, as well as being in a proven oil production area. The fee value of the land is approximately $4,000 per acre and the easement estate necessary for the installation of the approach lights is approximately 50 percent of fee valuation ($30,800). Crop damage is not included in the valuation; however, a 20-percent contingency factor ($6,160) is included and may be required, dependent on the time of year of actual taking. October and November would be a minimum cost period as to crop damage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any further questions on this item, gentlemen?

Mr. JONAS. No, but I call your attention to one sentence on page 163 where the Air Force seems to recognize that this problem does exist. I quote:

Further oil development in this critical area could virtually close the operation of this installation.

That seems to bear upon the question I asked.

Mr. GIBBENS. Sir, the statement we have in here has to do with the erection of the oil rigs that they use in drilling and which would be an obstacle in our flight path.

Mr. JONAS. That is not what this sentence I quoted says. It says, "Further oil development in the area."

General CURTIN. Yes, sir. It could be misinterpreted, sir. It actually was intended to refer to physical obstructions above surface.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you said, "Further oil development in this critical area could virtually close the operation of this installation without the easement," then, of course, you would have covered the waterfront. That is what you really mean, is it not?

General CURTIN. That is correct, sir. It is not as clearly written as it might be as we discussed it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is just a matter of clearing this up for the record so there will not be any question about it.

PAINE AIR FORCE BASE

On Paine Air Force Base there is a series of seven line items. What is the decrease in base population here as a result of the deletion of the BOMARC missile site?

Colonel PARKHILL. The population was decreased by 266 spaces.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How will that decrease be reflected insofar as usable buildings are concerned? Any in particular?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir; we do not feel that will have any impact on these particular items.

SELFRIDGE AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are six line items on Selfridge Air Force Base. What are you using for armament and electronic facilities at the present time?

Colonel PARKHILL. Mr. Chairman, we are using a small temporary building which was built for the flight line maintenance control and is required for that intended purpose. We are proposing a new standard armament electronic shop.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are you using for hospital facilities at the present time?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Sir, at the present time Selfridge consists of one permanent building of approximately 25,000 square feet, which was built in 1933 as the base hospital. That was augmented in 1941 and 1942 with approximately 12 temporary buildings, which are the old cantonment-type wards which were attached on to this one permanent building to make total facilities.

The existing temporary buildings are deteriorated and in need of replacement. The existing permanent building is totally inadequate in many critical areas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is to be an annex to the original building?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. No, sir; we propose a new facility altogether, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why are you putting a new facility there instead of an annex on the one already existing of permanent nature?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The existing one now, sir, consists of many small rooms. In the building at the present time are located surgery, X-ray, laboratory, that type of department. To try to rehabilitate or modernize those facilities to the size needed would be extremely expensive, and it is doubtful that we could ever bring them up to standard.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then you are going to construct a new building to house the particular facilities that you have just mentioned in the new building as against leaving them in the old building and using the new one to take care of your load requirements. Is that correct?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. That is correct, sir, but I would like to point out that the facilities now in the old permanent building are not adequate to serve the medical requirements for the installation at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming the new building is financed and constructed, what are you going to do with the one left there in the permanent category?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The permanent building, sir, will be turned over to the base and will be used for base administration purposes. At the present time they are programing one of the reserve wings and using that as their administrative facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you find it necessary to include a separate heating plant at the cost shown in your justifications? Is that incapable of delivering the B.t.u. required?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. The question, sir, deals with why we have a separate heating plant for the medical facility?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. At Selfridge, sir, there is no base central heating plant which can accommodate our requirements. There is only one plant that might be considered in the category of a central heating plant, and it was designed for the BOQ barracks. That does not have the capacity to handle our load. The existing plant in the hospital is not adequate to handle the new facility, and is in the same condition as the rest of the building. It is quite old and deteriorated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I conclude from your presentation here that the new buildings will be attached to your hospital requirements exclusively, or will they be centralized plants for distribution to absorb the heating requirement of many of your obsolescent buildings that apparently exist?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. This heating plant, sir, is being programed exclusively for the composite medical facility. It will not serve other buildings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it to be concluded from your answer that there will be a requirement later for another heating plant because of the obsolescence of the buildings you have referred to?

Colonel PARKHILL. I would like to answer that, Mr. Chairman. The other heating plants which Colonel Carmichael referred to are quite old. We feel they will suffice for a limited period of time, at least. In other words, we do not anticipate replacing them in the near future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What would you consider "near" as you use the term?

Colonel PARKHILL. We have had no requests from the base to replace these or modify them or upgrade them. I do not anticipate——

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long have they been in operation?

Colonel PARKHILL. I would like to verify this, but I think since World War II.

Colonel EDMONDS. I believe the other buildings were built between 1937 and 1943.

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Are you talking about the temporary buildings? Around 1941.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you find it necessary to air-condition the entire hospital at this location?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Sir, this facility does not call for total air conditioning. This is partial air conditioning in this weather zone. That includes the surgery, the delivery, specialized beds, and clinics.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is pretty much a standard procedure in all your hospitals at the present time, is it not?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. Yes, sir, depending upon the weather zone.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where is the nearest military, Veterans' Administration, or Public Health Service hospital at the present time?

Colonel CARMICHAEL. There is a U.S. Public Health hospital in Detroit, Mich. It is 25 miles away. It is for general long-term care. It has a normal bed capacity of 171, a current occupancy of 143, and an occupancy rate of 84 percent, sir. There is a Veterans' Administration hospital in Dearborn, Mich., for general type care, 925 beds, present occupancy 828, with a 90.6 percent occupancy rate. That is 50 miles away, sir. The closest Air Force hospital is at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, a distance of 243 miles away.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the enlisted men's service clubs reflected in the justification meet the requirements for this installation, or will you have to go back and add more to it?

Colonel PARKHILL. No, sir. This will complete the requirements as the missions are now programed for this base.

SUFFOLK COUNTY AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the land which you propose to acquire here at a cost of $2,600 per acre?

Colonel PARKHILL. Sir, the nature of the land is agricultural. The cost includes two residences and two farm buildings. This land is

required for the approach lights which are contained in the program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How closely has the price on the acreage been projected, gentlemen? This is a rather expensive price for land.

General CURTIN. I think it is in the improvements, Mr. Chairman. The cost includes a residence and two farm buildings which are located on this land.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, that is what runs the cost up.

General CURTIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you know at this time whether those buildings are applicable to the use of the military after you have procured them, or will you have to remove them? Are they buildings which can be moved, or not?

Colonel PARKHILL. I have nothing on that, sir. We would have to furnish that for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

Improvements on land to be acquired for construction of approach lights consist of—

One frame, bungalow-type dwelling valued at $8,000.
One barn valued at $4,000.
One concrete block storehouse valued at $3,500.

These buildings are in fair condition but are not suitable for Air Force use either at their present site or in a new location. The buildings could be relocated; however, the cost of relocating including new foundations, etc., would be excessive with respect to their life expectancy and such use as could be made of them.

TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have a series of several line items for Tyndall Air Force Base. What are you using for personal equipment at the present time, gentlemen?

Colonel PARKHILL. We are presently using a small temporary World War II facility which we would plan to tear down.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why can this not be combined with the squadron operations building, all in one?

Colonel PARKHILL. Squadron operations and personal equipment. I believe we do plan to put that in one building, is that not right?

Colonel TROMMERSHAUSSER. That is correct.

Colonel PARKHILL. That does not show in our justifications. However, our intentions are to combine that in one building.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask one general question having to do with the total amount of projects we have inquired into this morning. All of those which are in preliminary planning status are to have planning completed, as I understand it, before contracts are issued. Gentlemen, is that correct or incorrect? Be very careful with your answer.

Colonel EDMONDS. None of these items will be advertised for bids, Mr. Chairman, until we have complete and final plans and specifications.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Remember, we will hold that against you if you slip.

Colonel EDMONDS. Yes, sir. We hold that against ourselves in that respect. We just will not advertise until we get the plans completed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. OK. Thank you very much.

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1960.

NATIONAL GUARD

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. D. W. McGOWAN, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

LT. COL. L. R. MOORE, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET OFFICE, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

MAJ. GEN. DAVID W. TRAUB, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

Mr. SHEPPARD. General McGowan, I understand you have a statement you wish to present to the committee.

Proceed to make the statement, please.

GENERAL STATEMENT

General McGOWAN. This statement will cover briefly both the Air National Guard and the Army National Guard, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed.

General McGOWAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present and discuss with this committee the Army and Air National Guard military construction programs for fiscal year 1961.

The Army National Guard completed reorganization to the pentomic concept last October and the construction requirements are based on that new troop structure.

TOTAL ARMORY FACILITIES

As shown in the first chart, the total armory requirement to house 4,500 Army National Guard units is 2,732. The next three bars show the breakdown of that requirement. First, in gray, 729 State-owned armories are adequate. Second, in red, are the 1,061 armories constructed with Federal participation; 982 of these are still considered adequate, while the remaining 79 require alteration, expansion, or conversion. This 79 shown in hatched red, plus the 942 remaining requirement in blue produces the 1,021 armory projects contained in fiscal year 1960 and future years' construction programs. Although not shown on this chart, 643 of these 1,021 projects are new construction and 378 are alterations, expansions, or conversions.

ARMORY CONSTRUCTION OBLIGATIONS

The next chart graphically portrays armory construction obligations from fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1960.

Obligations progressed from $6 million in fiscal year 1953 to the high points of $26 plus million in fiscal year 1956 and 1957. From fiscal 1958 through 1960 funding restrictions held obligations to the $13 and $14 million levels.

The fiscal 1961 financial plan for Army National Guard construction provides $16.4 million for 103 armory projects and various minor construction. The nonarmory portion of $3.6 million supports 13

projects for training, maintenance, administration, and storage facilities.

The projects submitted for new authorization to the Armed Services Committees of Congress this year amount to $12.1 million.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Air National Guard, through a well-planned, long-range construction program, is continuing to modernize existing facilities and construct other necessary facilities in support of its assigned missions. In fiscal 1961 the Air National Guard construction program is limited to highest priority, hard-core items only. Recent accelerated conversions to higher performance jet aircraft have generated requirements for a number of these essential construction projects. It is of paramount importance that adequate support facilities be available as needed in order that our units be capable of maintaining a position of constant combat readiness, and further, to insure the safe and efficient operation of the high-performance aircraft and other complex weapons systems components in the Air National Guard inventory.

This concludes my statement. I shall be glad to answer any questions the chairman or committee members may have.

General Wilson is here to answer any questions for the Air National Guard.

We have a statement from the Army side which we can file.

JOINT USE OF FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. What have you done to insure joint use of facilities for the Reserve components, including the guard units?

General MCGOWAN. Joint utilization has received more and more attention, Mr. Chairman. We can insert the extent of it in the record by bringing up to date the testimony we put in the record 2 years ago.

(The information requested will be furnished to the committee.)

As you know, a major faction on the units on the Army side are in towns where there are no other Reserve components.

At two places in West Virginia and in Minnesota we are constructing jointly and simultaneously with Army Guard funds, Naval Reserve funds, and Army National Guard funds, so we are moving into that field substantially.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume, as in other Reserve operations, the National Guard is confronted with State authorizations where you cannot move because of certain reservations and restrictions based on the types of building utilized. Is that correct?

General MCGOWAN. We have many cases in the States where the provisions of the deed to the site are such that they are limited to National Guard usage, and were they used for other purposes the title would lapse.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are 14 States and Puerto Rico where joint utilization is in doubt or precluded by State law. Two of these, North Carolina and Texas, I understand, have agreed to future joint construction. What steps are you taking to secure joint utilization and construction in the other States and Puerto Rico?

General McGowan. The armory is so designed that provision is made in the basic plan for the addition of a Reserve wing for their supply, maintenance, and office and locker room facilities to hook onto the basic structure when later constructed.

Mr. Sheppard. What is being done in the State setups which are currently agreeable? Do you work that out with them jointly?

General McGowan. In those two specific States, North Carolina and Texas, I know we have current projects with provision for future construction of Reserve forces wings to the structures we build. I cannot answer from memory as to all the States.

Mr. Sheppard. What is being done as a matter of policy in your approach to the situation where you ask the States to realize costs to the Federal Government and to themselves? What is done in the way of joint utilization of structures?

General McGowan. Wherever construction is required in a town for both the Guard and the Reserve, if it is not a battalion size armory, approval to construct by the National Guard is contingent and dependent upon the willingness to have construction of a Reserve wing to the Army. That would require subsequent construction by them and joint utilization of the whole project when their wing is constructed.

The Department of Defense has been very stringent in that regard.

Mr. Sheppard. How much of the program here has to do with North Carolina and Texas, for example? What portion of the total here is involved?

General McGowan. I could not hazard a guess. I can get the figure for the record, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

North Carolina:	
Belmont (1–U)	$98,000
Greensboro (4–UP)	357,000
Hendersonville (1–U)	120,000
Laurinburg (1–U)	105,000
Rockingham (1–U)	98,000
Shallotte (1–U)	95,000
Wallace (1–U)	95,000
Total (4 percent of program)	968,000
Texas:	
Cuero (1–U(s))	$93,000
Dallas No. 5 (4–UP)	351,000
Levelland (1–U(s))	85,000
Brownsville (1–U(s))	85,000
Total (3 percent of program)	614,000

Of these projects, only two, Levelland and Brownsville, Tex., will be funded from the $8 million appropriation requested this year. The remaining projects were previously authorized and funds were appropriated last year.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, you have North Carolina and Texas which have agreed to joint construction?

General McGowan. Yes, sir; in certain instances.

Mr. Sheppard. Twelve other States have not. Do you think it would be advisable to hold further conferences with those States rather than going ahead with construction in advance which would make it more costly?

General McGowan. The Reserve funds and the Army Guard funds do not become available at the same time, we will say, as the State appropriations. If they do not all drop in our lap at the same time, as did happen in West Virginia and Minnesota, then we build what we can build, which is the armory for the National Guard, and the Reserve adds thereto.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, if you build in advance because of the State's budget revision, you construct on a premise where you can add to without having a separate construction taking place later on. Is that right?

General McGowan. Yes, sir.

As General Wilson reminds me, I should have said that all these projects, both Reserve and guard, are first considered by the Reserve Facilities Board in every State.

Mr. Sheppard. Even at that, perhaps something might happen in the legislature of those States and they would have no opportunity to review this at the time the presentation is made.

General McGowan. We are fully cognizant of the fact that concurrent construction on the part of all participants produces lower costs.

Mr. Sheppard. It is important not only to us but to you to get these things done properly and as economically as you can.

What would happen to your appropriated funds for Reserve components construction in these States, referring to those who have already concurred, if funds were withheld until such time as their budget considerations caught up with yours?

General McGowan. We have tried to get the availability of Federal, State, and Army Reserve funds all coming into usage at the same time. This year is the first we have been successful, and in only three projects. We will continue to press to bring that about.

Mr. Sheppard. Do you think we should appropriate funds for construction within these two States which have already said they will go along with joint operation until the budgets are comparable?

General McGowan. I would say yes, we should, Mr. Chairman, because they are willing to construct jointly as the Army Reserve funds become available, or to construct by increment.

Mr. Sheppard. You have these States which are in accord with the program. What will be your policy when you go to other States? You will tell them that certain States have agreed to these joint operations because it would be more costly without a joint operation? What is your attitude?

General McGowan. We will press the other States to secure, if necessary, amendment to their State laws; and, if no amendment to their State laws is required, we will insist that they agree to joint construction and joint occupation.

We have done that to a degree already, sir. We have one State where no construction has taken place in 2 years because they have not consented to it.

Mr. Sheppard. In other words, you just withheld funds for construction until they complied?

General McGowan. Yes, sir.

Mr. Jonas. Of course, General, in some localities, where you are participating with the State and local communities in building the Army National Guard units, they do not need Reserve facilties, and

therefore the problem would arise in only so-called metropolitan areas where you have Reserve units or where Reserve units are contemplated. Is that right?

General McGowan. That is quite right, sir. A major part of our guard construction occurs in small communities where there is no other Reserve unit.

Mr. Jonas. That is true in North Carolina. Many of the National Guard armories that have been constructed in the last few years have been in small towns.

General McGowan. Joint construction has its greatest validity where there is a total of one or two Reserve plus guard units in a town.

When we get into a place such as Columbia, where there would be better than a battalion of the Reserve and better than a battalion of the guard, our policy has been to authorize construction of separate battalion-sized armories in different locations in the community where they draw better on the population. Those projects are of a size where we do not effect any real savings. If we get a battalion-sized armory we have made our maximum savings.

USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Mr. Sheppard. What consideration have you given to the use of existing facilities in formulating this program?

General McGowan. The testimony will show, Mr. Chairman, that we originally had over 900 existing State-owned and State-constructed armories when we made our original estimate of our Army requirements that were considered, and many more that were not considered adequate.

With the new construction and the new reorganization the totals dropped somewhat. Our remaining requirement, however, still is about 1,000.

Before construction is allowed in a State, we have to insure, because the Department of Defense has carefully studied our plans, that we make use of all the unit spaces that have been provided in the State by the Federal Government or which has been provided by the States with their own construction programs prior to this Federal-supported construction, and we must insure that all the facilities are being used to the maximum before more are authorized for construction. We work closely with the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army on that. They are very strict on that score.

Mr. Sheppard. At what locations in this program are you building both Reserve and guard facilities?

General McGowan. We will supply the answer, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

Maryland: Baltimore—Dundalk (1–U)	$215,000
Minnesota: St. Cloud (2–UP & MVSB)	223,000
New Mexico: Silver City (1–U(s))	62,000
New York:	
Corning (Conv)	46,000
Malone (Conv)	59,000
Oswego (Exp-Rehab)	53,000
Texas: Dallas No. 4 (White Rock) (2–UP)	151,000

Mr. Sheppard. Thank you very much.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

WITNESS

MAJ. GEN. W. P. WILSON, DEPUTY CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
1. Public works construction:			
Armory construction	$10,937,391	$13,100,000	$15,450,000
Nonarmory construction	3,146,067	800,000	3,370,000
2. Minor construction		200,000	380,000
3. Planning	742,000	900,000	800,000
Total obligations (object class 10)	14,825,458	15,000,000	20,000,000
Financing:			
Comparative transfers from (−) other accounts	−14,825,458		
Unobligated balance brought forward			−15,179,868
Unobligated balance transferred from "Military construction, Army Reserve" (73 Stat. 559)		−6,960,868	
Unobligated balance carried forward		15,179,868	3,179,868
Appropriation (new obligational authority)		23,219,000	8,000,000

General Statement

Mr. Sheppard. We will insert in the record the statement of Gen. Clayton P. Kerr relative to the Army National Guard requirements, and essential justification pages.

Statement by Maj. Gen. Clayton P. Kerr, Assistant Chief, National Guard Bureau, Army

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I welcome the opportunity to appear before you to present the Army National Guard construction program, the progress to date and current requirements for funds to accomplish the proposed armory and nonarmory projects in the President's budget for fiscal year 1961, and also an estimate of the future appropriations required to complete the armory construction program.

The Army National Guard completed reorganization to the pentomic concept in October 1959 and this presentation is based on the new troop structure.

Based on new inventory and stationing plans for each State, the National Guard Bureau and the Department of the Army recently completed a study to determine the status of existing armory facilities and the requirements for construction in future fiscal years.

I have charts to illustrate our construction program.

TOTAL ARMORY FACILITIES

The total armory requirement to house the 4,500 federally recognized units of the Army National Guard as of July 1, 1959, is 2,732—as shown by the bar on the left. These facilities are in two categories: First, 729 State-owned armories are adequate. Second, of the 1,061 armories constructed with Federal participation, 982 are considered adequate, while the remaining 79 require alteration, expansion or conversion. This 79, when added to the 942 remaining requirement produces a total of 1,021 armory projects contained in fiscal year 1960 and future years' construction programs.

ARMORY REQUIREMENTS

The bar on the left of this chart represents these 1,021 armory projects which, as of July 1, 1959, were required to adequately house the units of the reorganized Army National Guard. The bar in the center represents the 378 existing armories which require alteration, expansion, or conversion. The bar

on the right shows the 643 complete new armories required to be built. These armories will replace interim or inadequate facilities which were constructed or provided with no Federal participation.

As shown by the tick marks—of this requirement for 643 new armories, the fiscal year 1960 $15 million program will permit us to build approximately 85 new armories and to alter, expand, or convert 8 more. The remaining requirement left for future construction in fiscal year 1961 and later years will be 558 new armories and alteration of 370 existing armories.

ARMORY CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Now, I would like to briefly cover the status of armory construction funds: $95 million is now the remaining appropriation requirement. As shown by the bar on the left, $239 million is the total Federal requirement to house the reorganized Army National Guard. Of this, Congress has already appropriated $144 million through fiscal year 1960, or 60 percent of the total, leaving $95 million shown on the right as the remaining appropriation requirement from fiscal year 1961 forward.

ARMORY CONSTRUCTION OBLIGATIONS

This chart graphically portrays armory construction progress under the provisions of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended, by dollar obligations from fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1960.

Obligations progressed from $6 million in fiscal year 1953 to the high points of $26-plus million in fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Funding restrictions held obligations in fiscal year 1958 to $13.1 million. The fiscal year 1959 and 1960 obligations reflect the continued limitation placed on annual obligations.

The financial plan for Army National Guard construction in fiscal year 1961 provides $16.4 million for 103 armory projects and various minor construction projects. The nonarmory portion of $3.6 million supports 13 projects to provide training, maintenance, administrative, and storage facilities.

This $20 million construction program for fiscal year 1961 is made up of $12 million carried over from appropriations made last year, plus the $8 million new appropriation we are requesting this year.

The projects submitted for authorization to the Armed Services Committees of Congress this year amount to $12.1 million. Of the 70 armory projects in the authorization request, 49 armories and all of the 7 nonarmory projects will be included in our funding program for fiscal year 1961. The justification data books submitted to your committee include $8.9 million for fiscal year 1961. The $0.9 million additional costs above the $8 million requested will be met from fiscal year 1960 carryover appropriation.

This concludes my statement—I shall be glad to answer any questions the chairman or committee members may have.

Army National Guard

ARMORY

Location	Type	Estimated Federal cost
Arizona: Case Grande	1 U (s)-MVSB	$108,000
Arkansas:		
Sheridan	1 unit (s)	45,000
Dumas	do	45,000
Perryville	do	45,000
Heber Springs	1 unit	45,000
California: Escondido	1 unit (s)	105,000
Colorado: Cortez	do	114,000
Connecticut: Stratford (Bridgeport)	2 U-plus	415,000
Florida: Jacksonville	2 U-P-MVSB	243,000
Hawaii: Honolulu	1 unit	102,000

Army National Guard—Continued

ARMORY—Continued

Location	Type	Estimated Federal cost
Idaho:		
Orofino	1 unit (s)	$75,000
Driggs	do	80,000
Indiana:		
Scottsburg	do	188,000
Jasper	2 units	218,000
Kansas: Lawrence	1 U–MVSB	102,000
Kentucky: Louisville	4 U-plus	285,000
Louisiana:		
Bogalusa	1 U-plus	180,000
Alexandria	3 U-plus	311,000
Natchitoches	1 unit	161,000
Bastrop	1 unit (s)	131,000
Massachusetts: Stoughton	do	210,000
Minnesota: Northfield	Exp	49,000
Mississippi:		
De Kalb	1 unit (s)	63,000
Carthage	do	63,000
Mendenhall	do	63,000
Jackson	3 U-plus	232,000
Eupora	1 unit (s)	63,000
Missouri: Rolla	1 unit	150,000
Montana:		
Anaconda	1 U (s)–P	66,000
Lewistown	1 unit (s)	66,000
Nevada:		
Elko	do	97,000
Hawthorne	do	97,000
New Hampshire:		
Dover	do	139,000
Claremont	do	139,000
New Jersey:		
Dover	2 U-plus	190,000
Riverdale	1 unit	171,000
Oregon:		
Newport	do	120,000
Portland	3 U-plus	393,000
Pennsylvania: Harrisburg	Exp	104,000
Puerto Rico:		
Sabana Grande	1 unit	63,000
Gurabo	1 U–plus	70,000
Rhode Island: Cranston	1 unit	184,000
South Dakota:		
Clear Lake	Exp	63,000
Philip	1 U–MVSB	145,000
Texas:		
Levelland	1 unit (s)	85,000
Brownsville	do	85,000
Vermont: Vergennes	do	135,000
West Virginia: Hinton	1 U (s)–MVSB	157,000
Wisconsin: Oshkosh	2 U–P–MVSB	235,000
Total, 49 projects		6,695,000
Armory total		6,695,000

NONARMORY

Georgia: Fort Stewart	Training facility	$423,000
Minnesota:		
Camp Ripley	Water tank and tower	160,000
Do	Training facility	750,000
Mississippi. Camp Shelby	do	423,000
Montana: Fort Wm. H. Harrison	do	123,000
Utah: Salt Lake City	Office and warehouse	266,000
Washington: Camp Murray	Warehouse conv	159,000
Total, 7 projects		2,304,000
Nonarmory total		2,304,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have the States made available matching funds for all construction in this program?

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

STATUS OF OBLIGATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of the funds made available by Congress last year for this program? What balance do you have left?

General WILSON. I will submit that for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

Fiscal year 1960 military construction, Army National Guard obligations as of March 31, 1960, totaled $3,813,000. It is estimated that $15 million will be obligated by June 30, 1960, in accordance with the OSD financial plan fiscal year 1960.

The fiscal year 1960 unobligated balance is estimated at $15.1 million of which $12.2 million will be a carryover of part of the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1960 and $2.9 million for completion of approved programs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record a list of the facilities to be constructed with the unapportioned funds.

(The information requested may be found on p. 735.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the Army National Guard?

(No questions.)

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. W. P. WILSON, CHIEF, AIR FORCE DIVISION, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU
COL. JOE MEIS, COMPTROLLER, AIR FORCE DIVISION, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU
COL. WILLIAM BATTISON, OFFICE OF INSTALLATIONS OF THE AIR FORCE DIVISION, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU
HERBERT SUFIT, DIRECTORATE OF BUDGET, AIR FORCE
COL. ARTHUR SMITH, DIRECTORATE OF BUDGET, AIR FORCE
COL. L. D. PERRY, OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT DIVISION, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, RESERVE FORCES
ELMER F. LYNCH, OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT DIVISION, OFFICE OF ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, RESERVE FORCES

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
1. Public works construction	$10,906,950	$15,667,000	$6,125,000
2. Minor construction			500,000
3. Planning	575,721	773,000	375,000
Total obligations	11,482,671	16,440,000	7,000,000
Financing: Comparative transfers from (−) other accounts	−11,482,671		
Appropriation (new obligational authority)		16,440,000	7,000,000

Object classification

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
AIR FORCE			
07 Other contractual services	$575,721	$773,000	$375,000
10 Lands and structures	9,397,374	14,147,200	5,701,800
Total, Air Force	9,973,095	14,920,200	6,076,800
ALLOCATION TO ARMY			
Total number of permanent positions	198	198	120
Full-time equivalent of all other positions	1	1	1
Average number of all employees	193	193	115
Number of employees at end of year	151	160	95
Average grade and salary	9.0 $6,988	9.0 $7,012	8.7 $7,036
Average salary of ungraded positions	$4,576	$4,580	
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions	$1,340,233	$1,346,170	$802,419
Positions other than permanent	4,478	4,500	4,500
Other personal services	76,432	79,330	63,081
Total personal services	1,421,143	1,430,000	870,000
07 Other contractual services	4,140	4,800	3,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	83,077	83,800	49,000
13 Refunds, awards, and indemnities	1,013	1,000	1,000
15 Taxes and assessments	203	200	200
Total, Army	1,509,576	1,519,800	923,200
Total obligations	11,482,671	16,440,000	7,000,000

General Statement

Mr. Sheppard. Insert the general statement of General Wilson. (The statement follows:)

Statement of Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Assistant Chief for the National Guard Bureau, Air National Guard, on Military Construction, Air National Guard

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present and discuss with this committee the Air National Guard military construction program for fiscal year 1961.

The Air National Guard military construction program is designed to provide facilities when and where needed in support of operating programs established by Headquarters, USAF. Through the application of a well-planned long-range construction program we are progressively modernizing facilities of World War II vintage and constructing other necessary facilities such as runway extensions, apron expansions, etc. on a phased basis to coincide with aircraft conversions, receipt of new weapons, and/or changes in mission assignment. Wherever possible we meet our facility needs through the utilization of available military facilities. In other cases, we either lease or construct needed facilities. For example, a typical flying facility first must have sufficient runway length for the safe operation of aircraft assigned. In support of these aircraft, other essential basic facilities must be provided. These would typically include a maintenance hangar, a crash and structural fire station, supply buildings, motor-vehicle repair shop, operations and training building, fuel-storage areas, vehicle-parking areas, and necessary roads and utilities.

Presently, we are operating from 94 flying bases which are located on Air Force bases, Navy bases, State, municipal, and private fields. We are currently operating 38 of these facilities on a joint-use basis with Air Force, Navy, Air Force Reserve units, and other Federal agencies. The others with the exception of two privately owned fields are used jointly with civil agencies. We also currently maintain facilities at 42 nonflying bases in support of our aircraft control and warning and other communications programs.

For this year's program we are requesting funds to finance our highest priority items only. These include runway and taxiway extensions, rehabs, parking aprons, a control tower, and at one installation, where no facilities are available, we are proposing construction of certain typically required support facilities.

In addition to the request for funds to support our line-item requirements, we are also requesting funds to finance minor construction projects which are urgently required and cannot await inclusion in a subsequent military construction program. Like the active establishment our experience in recent years has indicated an increasing need for this capability in order to utilize eixsting funds and readily respond to mission changes or aircraft conversions dictated by defense policies or change in requirements. Projects developed under this program will be administered in the same manner as they are in the active establishment and the same crtieria and ground rules will apply.

In summary, this year the Air National Guard is requesting $7 million. Of this amount, $6,125,000 is for new construction, $500,000 for minor construction and $375,000 for planning and design.

My staff and I are at your service to answer any further questions you might have concerning our military construction program.

SUMMARY STATEMENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Also insert in the record summary pages of the justifications.

(The summary pages follow:)

54569—60—pt. 2——35

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

STATION: Planning and Design
DIR TO TOWN:
COUNTY, STATE:
COMMAND: DATE OCC:

GOVT LEASED:
GOVT OWNED:
OTHER ACRES:
TOTAL ACRES:

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
375	-0-	-0-	-0-	375	-0-

PRINCIPAL MISSION:

Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P.L.	QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Planning and Design									375

STATION: Barnes Municipal Airport GOVT
LEASED: 17

DIR TO TOWN: 1.9 mi SE Westfield GOVT
OWNED:

COUNTY, STATE: Hampden, Mass. OTHER ACRES:
TOTAL ACRES: 17

COMMAND: ANG DATE OCC: 1947

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
94		659		753		

EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
2,920	1,047	1,030	843	675	168

PRINCIPAL MISSION:
104 Tac Ftr Gp Hq
131 Tac Ftr Sq
131 Wea Flt (Forecasting & Obs)

Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P.L.	QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Runway, Prim/Instrument	10			237,500	181,250	56,250	56,250	SY	675

STATION: Congaree Air Base

DIR TO TOWN: 16 SE Columbia

COUNTY, STATE: Calhoun, S. C.

COMMAND: ANG DATE OCC: 1946

		OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
		BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
GOVT LEASED:	2300							
GOVT OWNED:		102		775		877		
OTHER ACRES:								
TOTAL ACRES:	2300							

PRINCIPAL MISSION:	EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
167 Ftr Gp Hq (AD)	1,429	496	60	873	432	441

Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P.L.	QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Runway, overrun	14			34,000	-	34,000	34,000	SY	163
Apron, operational	15			40,500	30,500	10,000	10,000	SY	144
Control Tower	16			1	-	1	1	EA	125

STATION: Foss Field

DIR TO TOWN: 2 mi NW Sioux Falls

COUNTY, STATE: Minnehaha, S. D.

COMMAND: ANG DATE OCC: 1948

	GOVT
LEASED:	22
OWNED:	
OTHER ACRES:	
TOTAL ACRES:	22

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
132		745		877		

PRINCIPAL MISSION:
114 Ftr Gp Hq (AD) (132 Wg)
175 Ftr Intcp Sq

EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
3,134	2,100	123	911	675	236

				QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P. L.	Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Runway, Prim Instrument	11			237,500	181,250	56,250	56,250	SY	675

STATION: Hickam AFB

DIR TO TOWN: 2 NW Honolulu

COUNTY, STATE: Oahu, Hawaii

COMMAND: ANG DATE OCC: 1948

		OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
		BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
GOVT LEASED:								
GOVT OWNED:	20							
OTHER ACRES:		60		553		613		
TOTAL ACRES:	20							

PRINCIPAL MISSION:	EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
199 Ftr Intcp Sq 199 Wea Flt (Forecasting & Obs)	4,856	-0-	2,662	2,194	604	1,590

				QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P. L.	Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Taxiway, Runway access	9			42,000	-0-	42,000	42,000	SY	604

STATION: Hutchinson Naval Air Station
DIR TO TOWN: 12 mi NW Hutchinson
COUNTY, STATE: Pratt, Kansas
COMMAND: ANG DATE OCC: 1957

		OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
		BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
GOVT LEASED:								
GOVT OWNED:	2,565	56		395		451		
OTHER ACRES:								
TOTAL ACRES:	2,565							

	EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
PRINCIPAL MISSION: 117 Tac Recon Sq (127 Wg)	1,389	-0-	-0-	1,389	1,389	-0-

				QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P. L.	Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Apron, Operational (rehab)	12			60,000		60,000	60,000	SY	720
Runway, Prim/Instr (rehab)	13			93,000		93,000	93,000	SY	669

STATION: Jackson Municipal

DIR TO TOWN: 7 mi NE Jackson

COUNTY, STATE: Rankin, Miss.

COMMAND: ANG DATE OCC: 1953

	GOVT
LEASED:	60
GOVT OWNED:	
OTHER ACRES:	
TOTAL ACRES:	60

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF
60		343		403		

	EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
PRINCIPAL MISSION: 183 Aeromed Transp Sq L (106 GP)	2,689	-0-	-0-	2,689	2,401	288

				QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P. L.	Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Hangar, Reserve Forces	1			27,390	-0-	27,390	27,390	SF	657
Oper. and Trng Bldg.	2			41,525	-0-	41,525	41,525	SF	996
Apron, Operational	3			40,500	-0-	40,500	40,500	SY	583
Automotive Maint. Shop	4			4,040	-0-	4,040	4,040	SF	83
Crash Truck Station	5			2,500	-0-	2,500	2,500	SF	48
Motor Pool Parking	6			3,600	-0-	3,600	3,600	SY	22
Paint, Oil, Dope Stg	7			600	-0-	600	600	SF	9
Motor Fuel Stg.	8			4,000	-0-	4,000	4,000	GAL.	3

STATION: Minor Construction

DIR TO TOWN:

COUNTY, STATE:

COMMAND: DATE OCC:

GOVT LEASED:	
GOVT OWNED:	
OTHER ACRES:	
TOTAL ACRES:	

OFFICERS		AIRMEN			CIVILIANS	
BASE	TRANS/ROT	BASE	TRANS/ROT	MILITARY	NATIONALS	DAF

PRINCIPAL MISSION:

EST TOTAL COST (000)	Assets as of 30 Jun 59 (000)	Funded Constrn Not In Inventory (000)	Balance Required (000)	FY 1961 Request (000)	Future Years (000)
500	-0-	-0-	-0-	500	-0-

Project Title	Priority	Tenant Comd	Auth P. L.	QUANTITIVE REQUIREMENTS			APPROPRIATION REQUEST		
				Total Req.	Financed	Unfinanced	Quantity	Unit	Amount (000)
Minor Construction									500

REQUIREMENTS FOR F–102 AIRCRAFT

Mr. SHEPPARD. What provision does this program make for the development of the advance fighters to be assigned to the guard, such as the F–102, et cetera?

General WILSON. As you know, in the past 2 or 3 weeks there has been quite a change and you have heard a lot of testimony before the Appropriations Committee on the change in the air defense structure. There will definitely be a change in the construction requirements and money requirements in the Air National Guard in fiscal year 1961. It is expected quite a few airplanes in the present program will not be firm as to exact locations, but we have not been able to get together with the Air Defense Command to pick out locations because they are coming up so fast. We expect there will be something over 14 squadrons assigned to the Air National Guard in 1961 of the F–102.

This will require, to meet our requirements, construction of approximately $6.5 million of different facilities.

I can give you an idea of what those facilities will be and what we think will be the requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It might be well to have that.

General WILSON. We expect in the $6.5 million we would have to build 14 weapons calibration shelters. This is to check the missiles, the GAR I and II missile.

We will have to build a rocket storage or missile storage building at the locations where we do not have them now. Those will number eight.

We will perhaps have to modify some of the present rocket storage to take care of the missile at six locations.

In addition to that we will require some five nose docks which are presently available in the Air Force inventory. We will pick them up and move them to our bases.

Therefore we will generate an additional construction requirement of $6.5 million which will increase our overall amount to $13.5 million.

We have submitted this to the Department of Defense. I do not know as yet what action has been taken on it.

Mr. Garlock, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management, sent a letter to the Depatrment of Defense asking for funds in both construction and O. & M. due to this change in the 102 picture.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You said there is a total of $13 million?

General WILSON. $13.5 million sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much are you requesting be funded here out of that total?

General WILSON. Actually this amount in the President's budget is for $7 million. We are asking for all of that.

Based upon current proposals it is contemplated that they will increase the present budget an additional $6.5 million, or to $13.5 million.

To do the job that is necessary and to take care of the equipment that is coming into the program we will need this additional money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the so-called tight budget concept of the President you would not be too optimistic, would you?

General WILSON. I would not be overly optimistic at all, sir.

The Air Force has recognized this requirement. We are taking over certain bases where they are deactivating. We cannot do this job on our present budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have always had a thorough knowledge of your requirements, General.

What percentage out of those presently being funded might be dropouts?

General WILSON. There should be no dropouts. This program has been cut to the bone.

Mr. SHEPPARD. States are ready?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, plans are underway and everything else. This is a reduction from our original request, as you understand, Mr. Chairman, which is perfectly normal. This has been cut to the bone.

If we get this additional air defense mission we will have to get an increase in construction to meet our requirements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions.

Mr. WHITTEN. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your appearance, General.

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1960.

ARMY RESERVE

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. FREDERICK M. WARREN, CHIEF, U.S. ARMY RESERVE AND ROTC AFFAIRS

COL. GILES L. EVANS, JR., CHIEF, CONSTRUCTION DIVISION, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS

COL. H. F. ROSS, CHIEF, SUPPLY AND FACILITIES DIVISION, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ARMY RESERVE AND ROTC AFFAIRS

LT. COL. L. R. MOORE, OFFICE, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY

LT. COL. H. B. THOMPSON, OFFICE, CHIEF OF ARMY RESERVE AND ROTC AFFAIRS

ELMER F. LYNCH, OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT DIVISION, OFFICE OF ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, RESERVE FORCES

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct obligations:			
1. Public works construction	$22,926,144	$22,150,000	$11,250,000
2. Minor construction			180,000
3. Planning	950,000	850,000	570,000
Total, direct obligations	23,876,144	23,000,000	12,000,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
1. Public works construction	869		
Total, obligations	23,877,013	23,000,000	12,000,000
Financing:			
Comparative transfers to other accounts	14,825,458		
Unobligated balance brought forward	−44,517,206	−12,065,604	−2,104,736
Unobligated balance transferred to "Military construction, Army National Guard" (73 Stat 559)		6,960,868	
Advances and reimbursements from other accounts	−869		
Unobligated balance carried forward	12,065,604	2,104,736	2,104,736
Appropriation (new obligational authority)	6,250,000	20,000,000	12,000,000

Object classification

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Total number of permanent positions	420	350	196
Full-time equivalent of all other positions	1	1	
Average number of all employees	412	345	190
Number of employees at end of year	337	340	185
Average GS grade and salary	8.3 $6,157	8.3 $6,181	8.2 $6,204
Average salary of ungraded positions	6,822	6,822	6,822
Direct obligations:			
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions	$2,496,813	$2,114,879	$1,178,972
Positions other than permanent	3,536	3,400	
Other personal services	84,342	52,721	21,028
Total personal services	2,584,691	2,171,000	1,200,000
02 Travel	71,293	71,000	21,000
03 Transportation of things	9,889	10,000	3,000
04 Communication services	13,503	14,000	4,000
05 Rents and utility services	32,211	32,000	10,000
06 Printing and reproduction	29,262	29,000	9,000
07 Other contractual services	808,480	808,000	242,000
08 Supplies and materials	15,535	16,000	5,000
09 Equipment	357,961	358,000	107,000
10 Land and structures	19,840,220	19,350,000	10,322,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	111,561	139,000	77,00
13 Refunds, awards and indemnities	525	1,000	
15 Taxes and assessments	613	1,000	
Total direct obligations	23,877,144	23,000,000	12,000,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
08 Supplies and materials	869		
Total obligations	23,877,013	23,000,000	12,000,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall next consider the Army Reserve. You have a prepared statement you wish to present to the committee?

Colonel EVANS. In the absence of General Seeman, I should like to introduce this overall statement on behalf of the Army. General Warren and General McGowan will present their Reserve and Guard programs in detail.

STATEMENT BY L. E. SEEMAN, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD APPROPRIATION AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE APPROPRIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am happy to again have the pleasure of appearing before this subcommittee to present the Reserve Forces portion of the Army's fiscal year 1961 military construction program. I mean specifically the appropriations requested for military construction, Army National Guard and military construction, Army Reserve. I shall cover the general aspects of the requests for Army Reserve and Army National Guard facility construction. Representatives of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard are present to respond in detail to any questions regarding their respective programs.

For the Army Reserve, the proposed appropriation of $12 million is based on requirements for 34 new Army Reserve Centers, and 16 projects which are additions to present centers. These additions are chiefly for training space and vehicle maintenance space essential to the training program. The Army Reserve funding plan is based on revised scope and construction criteria approved by the Department of Defense. Accordingly the latest revised cost estimates are shown for each project.

For the Army National Guard the proposed fiscal year 1961 appropriation of $8 million together with $12 million of appropriations carried over from prior years would permit obligations in the amount of $20 million for this program during fiscal year 1961. This total program of obligations would provide 96 new armories, 7 projects for conversion of present armories and various minor construction projects, and 13 nonarmory projects which are summer training and supply-administrative facilities.

The authorization for these projects comes from prior years' authorization and the proposed authority contained in H.R. 10777 and S. 3006 currently under consideration by the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, respectively. This new authorization, added to valid carryover, will provide a total authorization of $15.5 million for the Army Reserve and $24.1 million for the Army National Guard. Against these projects, fiscal year 1961 obligations of $12 million for the Army Reserve and $20 million for the Army National Guard are planned.

The planned carryover of funds into fiscal year 1962 is estimated at $2.1 million for the Army Reserve and $3.2 million for the National Guard. As in the case of the Active Army authorization and funding levels, we believe the carryovers of the Reserve Forces construction are at the minimum level for preserving working program continuity.

The Army estimates that the remaining facilities requirement after fiscal year 1961 will be 608 new Reserve centers out of the total present requirement estimated at 1,800 (which includes leased and donated facilities); and 462 National Guard armories out of an estimated net requirement of 2,732 when the construction program is completed. Additionally, there will be a requirement for approximately 355 modifications of existing armories. We continue to exploit all possible joint use of National Guard and Reserve assets as well as joint use with other Navy and Air Force Reserve units.

This concludes my presentation of the proposed military construction appropriation for the Reserve components of the Army which is contained in the bill before you. The detailed justifications for projects to support our requests for appropriations are contained in two books. Sufficient copies have been furnished to the committee counsel for each of the committee members.

Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and Maj. Gen. F. M. Warren, the Chief, Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs, are both here to present their respective programs. Since our appearance before you last year, General Warren has succeeded General Palladino who was given new and increased responsibilities.

Statement of Maj. Gen. Frederick M. Warren, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs

Major General Warren. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am General Warren, Chief, Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs. It is my pleasure at this time to report on the Army Reserve construction program under chapter 133, title 10, United States Code.

A graphic illustration, enclosure 1, shows that during the period fiscal year 1950 through fiscal year 1958, 305 new centers had been started, and last year, fiscal year 1959, 86 centers were placed under contract. In fiscal year 1960, 70 new center starts are planned for construction from funds which were made available under Public Law 86–275. This will provide a total of 461 centers constructed or under construction through fiscal year 1960. The total requirement for new center construction to support the USAR authorized strength is 1,103. In addition to the planned 461 centers through fiscal year 1960, 642 more centers will be required in fiscal year 1961 and future years.

In fiscal year 1959, 25 additions to existing buildings were placed under construction, and 79 more are planned for fiscal year 1960. These projects consist of expansions, assembly halls, and maintenance shops as shown on the next chart, enclosure 2.

Chart 3 summarizes the status of Army Reserve construction funds. You will note that by the end of fiscal year 1959, we had obligated $101.4 million of the $106.5 million available and appropriated up to that time. During fiscal year 1960, we plan to obligate $23 million which brings us to a total of $124.4 million of the total $126.5 million which has been appropriated for obligation through fiscal year 1960.

It is anticipated that the remaining $2.1 million will be obligated in early fiscal year 1961 and that a like amount will be carried over into fiscal year 1962.

Subsequent to our appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, the line-item costs in this program have been revised. With the approval of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, these revisions have been submitted to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

Contained in the fiscal year 1961 line-item authorization list, which has been submitted to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, are 42 centers and 16 additions. Added to this are 1 project contained in Public Law 85–685 and 6 in Public Law 86–149. This brings the total proposed authorization to 49 centers and 16 additions. For fiscal year 1961, we are requesting new appropriations of $12 million. It is planned that these funds will be used to meet our target of 34 centers and 16 additions, including the 6 minor construction projects, for contract awards in fiscal year 1961.

It is our policy to jointly use or construct Army Reserve centers with all Reserve components where practicable, and where it is agreeable with the States as concerns the National Guard. Investigation is made as to such practicability prior to initiation of construction. There are 67 of our constructed and programed centers that are jointly used. Of these, there are 24 centers constructed jointly with the Naval Reserve or are planned for the future. With the National Guard, one center has been jointly constructed; two are under construction; negotiations are in progress for one other project; and plans are being developed for the expansion of two Army Reserve centers by the National Guard. Additionally, there are two projects in this program where the prospects for joint construction with the National Guard appear to be favorable.

I am pleased to report that the reorganization of the Army Reserve is virtually complete. Throughout the implementation of this vast undertaking, a consideration foremost in our planning was proper utilization of the centers provided by chapter 133, title 10, United States Code. Consequently we feel that we have a sound and valid construction program that will, upon completion, fulfill the training facilities requirements for the Army Reserve.

In conclusion, gentlemen, we have made good progress since we last appeared before you. The MCAR program has played and will continue to play a major role in attaining, at the earliest practicable date, the readiness which will permit Reserve units to meet their mobilization requirements.

It is recommended that the fiscal year 1961 line-item appropriation program, previously provided to the committee, be approved.

Gentlemen, this concludes my statement on the Army Reserve construction program. If you have any questions, I will be pleased to answer them.

We would be happy to attempt to answer any questions you have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much, General.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM FOR 1961

We will insert in the record pages 1, 2, and 3 of the justifications.

(The information referred to follows:)

U.S. Army Reserve construction program—Fiscal year 1961 summary

Location	Authorized strength	Drill pay strength	Assigned strength	Facility size		Cost (thousands)
				ARC (Unit)	MS (Bay)	
California:						
Los Angeles (No. 2)	2,474	1,510	1,550	----------	5	$73
Pasadena	822	464	676	----------	3	58
Colorado: Boulder	239	186	161	1	2	350
Florida:						
Miami (N)	798	525	543	3	3	498
Tampa (Drew Field)	657	410	457	2	3	428
Hawaii: Wailuku-Maui	197	160	189	1(M)	1	225
Illinois:						
Galesburg	324	271	127	1(M)	1	182
Marion	172	109	127	1(M)	1	182
Indiana:						
Lafayette	510	370	321	----------	3	58
Rushville	152	122	116	1(M)	1	182
Iowa:						
Creston	184	110	108	1(M)	1	173
Mount Pleasant	154	120	103	1(M)	1	173
Kentucky:						
Fort Thomas	497	431	393	2	3	476
Louisville	670	670	538	----------	3	55
Louisiana:						
Bogalusa	213	118	117	1(M)	1	183
Houma	198	154	127	1(M)	1	164
Minnesota:						
Le Sueur	184	110	99	1(M)	1	190
Willmar	160	125	95	1(M)	1	190
Mississippi: Tupelo	142	114	145	1(M)	1	167
Montana: Kalispell	368	146	134	1(M)	1	190
Nebraska: Lincoln	431	387	330	----------	3	55
New Mexico: Artesia	218	116	112	1(M)	1	173
New York:						
Albany	754	415	376	----------	3	61
Elmira (Horseheads)	431	323	263	----------	3	61
Penn Yan	186	145	117	1(M)	1	190
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	862	597	593	----------	3	49
Ohio:						
Akron No. 2	1,117	691	609	3	3	574
Cleveland	1,517	929	905	5	5	746
Mount Vernon	271	152	148	1(M)	1	182
Toledo	1,172	798	979	[1] 1	----------	77
Oklahoma: Shawnee	125	125	129	1(M)	1	173
Pennsylvania:						
New Castle	184	110	144	1(M)	1	182
Pittsburgh No. 3	1,270	742	914	3	3	574
Tobyhanna	146	114	105	1(M)	1	182
Tennessee:						
Kingsport	349	231	242	1	2	333
Oak Ridge	188	147	133	1(M)	1	164
Texas:						
Odessa	184	110	126	1(M)	1	175
Lubbock	583	408	401	[1] 1	1	111
San Antonio No. 2	860	517	451	3	3	520
Yoakum	184	110	101	1(M)	1	164
Virginia:						
Alexandria (DC No. 3)	1,340	966	979	3	3	553
Petersburg (Fort Lee)	631	526	347	2	3	452
West Virginia:						
Bluefield	164	90	87	1(M)	1	173
Clarksburg	326	191	218	1	2	350
Various locations	----------	----------	----------	[2]	----------	179

[1] Expansion. [2] Minor construction.

FORMULA USED FOR DETERMINING ARMY REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice that the relation between drill pay strength and assigned strength varies somewhat. What is your criteria in this respect in approving a project for construction?

Colonel Ross. The assigned strength of the units must be equal to 75 percent of the rated capacity of the constructed facility and the pay drill strength must be equal to 85 or 90 percent of the rated capacity of the constructed facilities. The 85 percent is used for the three unit and smaller centers and the 90 percent for four unit and larger.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I notice reflected on page 2 of your justification under the title "Heads of Assigned Strength and Drill Pay Strength" there is considerable variance, as you run through the total figures, not perhaps in single instances so much, but as you total it up in the final analysis. What is the relationship between the two, please? It creates a difference.

Colonel Ross. You have to take those on any one center. On page 2, for example, we are asking for the construction of the 1 unit (modified), which is a 100-man center. The assigned strength of that unit as of this date was 117 men. The allowable drill pay strength is 118 and the authorized strength is 213. However, within the criteria for construction, we cannot construct for the authorized or T.O. & E. strength of 213. We can only construct for the 118. If they are permitted a drill pay strength of 170 at some future date, then we can put an addition onto it provided the assigned strength is equivalent to at least 75 percent of the rated capacity of the proposed facility. Right now they are way below that, but they are qualified for a 1-unit (modified) 100-man center.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the drill pay strength supposed to be an assumptive figure as against the assigned strength?

Colonel THOMPSON. Sir, on these strengths, on these one-unit modified centers, they have a rated capacity of 100 men. They are for a company- or battery-sized unit and the objective strength in the left column, we call it drill pay here, at the top, 118, assigned, 117, and the big difference for that one, as you say, is not very much out of line. However, down below it, at Willmar, Minn., for instance, drill pay strength of 125, they have 95 people on board. They can bring up the strength to 125 by recruiting. Down at Tupelo, drill pay strength of 114. They now have 145 assigned. Eventually, they must round out to 114. These are for one-battery or company-size units.

General WARREN. I think the question has to do with the difference between the authorized strength and drill pay.

Colonel THOMPSON. The authorized strength of any particular one here, this 213 is the full authorized or wartime strength of the unit. We do not organize them on that basis now, so we have a factor, a percentage factor, that we consider the minimum for manning of particular-type units so that is 118 in this case. That follows through all the way down.

General WARREN. The authorized strength is actually what we call the T.O. & E. strength. Our units are organized anywhere from 53 to about 78 percent, so that the figure drill pay strength is actually what they are presently authorized. They cannot exceed that at the present time, so when you see 117 against 118, that unit is almost up to full authorized or allowable strength at the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would appear, generally speaking, between the two line items, titled items of drill pay strength and assigned strength, that there is considerable difference. That has nothing to do at the moment, I presume, in the construction requirement as such, but there is a hiatus there in funds if one is to take this literally. You have to strike a broad law of percentage, do you not?

General WARREN. Yes, sir. The drill pay strength and assigned strength will be pretty consistent and close, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on this item? The gentleman on my left?

JOINT USE OF FACILITIES

Mr. JONAS. No, sir; except I would like to ask General Warren what the principal objections are that you receive when you seek a jointly used facility? Our inability to attain joint use of Reserve armories has disturbed this committee. I am thinking of one city where we have a Naval Reserve armory and Air Force Reserve armory, two or three National Guard armories, Army Reserve Force armory, all in separate buildings and separate locations. I understand from your statement that you are making some progress in working out joint use, but what are the principal objections that you run into and why can't we do more along that line?

General WARREN. Mr. Congressman, we are exploring to the fullest the possibility of extending joint facilities. Answering your question specifically, we have a directive, a strong directive from the Defense Department that we shall jointly use facilities where at all practicable. Some States have laws which would prohibit joint utilization by the National Guard and Reserve. Where there is no such law, we make every effort to have joint facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In how many States do you have that law?

General WARREN. I cannot answer that. We can supply that for the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

There are 13 States.

Mr. JONAS. That would apply only to the National Guard?

General WARREN. Yes, sir. Then another objection is, the National Guard, in erecting their facilities often do so in conjunction with communities, either a school board or other municipality, and frequently conflict of interests may arise. Their facilities are very frequently used by civic organizations.

Mr. JONAS. I notice you do not say you have any joint use with Air Force Reserve units. You have none?

General WARREN. None that I know of. We have several with the Navy.

Mr. JONAS. You have 24 either jointly used now or planned for the future.

Why can't you have any joint-use arrangement with the Air Force?

General WARREN. I think that that would be harder than any other of the services. Their facilities are generally out a airports. They are inaccessible to our personnel. In addition to that the Air Force requires specific facilities built for their particular purposes that may

not lend themselves to our utilization. Furthermore, difference in types of units might preclude joint usage. For instance, just recently we tried to go in with the Air Force at one of their installations in Ohio, our unit there was to be a tank unit. The Air Force objected—and we believe reasonably so—to the use of tanks within the Air Force Reserve area.

Mr. JONAS. Your statement indicated that this subject was being pursued vigorously.

General WARREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to hear it. I would hope that continued emphasis would be placed on the desirability of joint use of these facilities to the greatest extent possible.

General WARREN. Defense Department directs on every authorization request that this be the first consideration, whether there is any possibility of joint construction and usage.

Mr. JONAS. Does the Defense Department leave it up to the services to work out agreements or does anybody in DOD try to get you together to see that either the Navy or the Army use a little ground here and there to work out an agreement?

General WARREN. Yes, sir; they supervise that, sir.

Colonel EVANS. They review each and every project and require that we show that joint utilization has been explored and if it is not feasible, why it is not feasible, before we are allowed to come to the Congress or the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. JONAS. Did they ever question your decision and overrule you?

Colonel EVANS. Yes, sir. They questioned. I do not know whether they have overruled. There have been extensive questions on more than one project.

General WARREN. There are representatives of the Air Force here who might expand on the statement.

Colonel WILSON. Just recently the Air Reserve visited Governor Rockefeller in New York. We have under study all the Reserve armories in the State to see why we cannot effect joint utilization. We are covering every National Guard armory in New York. Wherever we have a unit that they could give us maybe 2 nights a week, if they had it 3, we are working it out that way.

Mr. JONAS. I can see you would have a serious problem with a lot of National Guard units because the State contributes some funds and frequently so do the local communities. Often the basis on which local communities raise their money is that they will have the opportunity to use the facility on occasion, but that situation does not exist within the services themselves.

General WARREN. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. We provide all of the funds for Air Force, Army, and Navy Reserve armories. I would personally like to see considerable progress made in working out joint use.

I understand from this hearing this morning that you are making efforts. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, thank you very much for your appearance.

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1960.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

WITNESS

BRIG. GEN. FELIX L. VIDAL, DEPUTY FOR AIR FORCE RESERVE AFFAIRS OFFICE, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR RESERVE FORCES

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
1. Public works construction		$3,880,000	$3,700,000
2. Minor construction			150,000
3. Planning		120,000	150,000
Total obligations		4,000,000	4,000,000
Financing: Appropriation (new obligational authority)		4,000,000	4,000,000

Object classification

AIR FORCE			
07 Other contractual services		$120,000	$150,000
10 Lands and structures		3,371,500	1,859,400
Total, Air Force		3,491,500	2,009,400
ALLOCATION ACCOUNTS			
Total number of permanent positions		45	45
Average number of all employees		40	40
Number of employees at end of year		35	35
Average GS grade and salary		9.2 $6,497	9.1 $6,520
01 Personal services:			
Permanent positions		$265,065	$266,078
Other personal services		8,935	7,922
Total personal services		274,000	274,000
07 Other contractual services		14,800	87,200
10 Lands and structures		202,400	1,612,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions		17,300	17,400
Total, allocation accounts		508,500	1,990,600
Total obligations		4,000,000	4,000,000
Obligations are distributed as follows:			
Air Force		3,491,500	2,009,400
Navy		216,200	1,696,000
Army		292,300	294,600

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, we will pick up next the Air Force Reserve program.

If you gentlemen have statements we will insert them in the record.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. FELIX L. VIDAL, DEPUTY FOR AIR FORCE RESERVE AFFAIRS OFFICE, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR RESERVE FORCES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a pleasure to again appear before you as Deputy for Air Force Reserve Affairs to discuss the Air Force Reserve military construction appropriation program for fiscal year 1961.

FORCE STRUCTURE (UNITS)

The Reserve unit structure is organized to serve in the event of mobilization, and consists of flying and nonflying units. The flying structure provides for 15 troop carrier wings, 45 troop carrier squadrons and 5 air rescue squadrons.

These 50 squadrons are utilizing 37 installations for training purposes. The 37 flying installations are presently situated at 19 Regular Air Force bases and 3 Navy installations, plus joint utilization with the Air National Guard at 9 of 15 civil airports.

The support forces, nonflying, consists of 52 diverse-type units to support certain specific mobilization requirements of the Active Force for communications, air evacuation, air resupply and medical units. These nonflying units have been dispersed throughout the country and located with other Air Force Reserve and Regular Air Force units to achieve economy in operation by fully utilizing existing facilities and services to meet training requirements.

FACILITY REQUIREMENTS (UNITS)

The Air Force gives priority to the construction of facilities to support the tactical capability of the 45 troop carrier squadrons.

The facilities approved by our long-range construction program such as hangars, airfield pavement, warehouses, fire stations, auto shops, wash racks, operational and training space, and when fully substantiated, dormitories for weekend reservists are considered to be the minimum required.

Standards developed by the Air Force for each of the above facilities have been approved by Office, Secretary of Defense.

All of the troop carrier locations are now in operation. Minimum operational-type facility requirements at 20 locations have been met through a combination of new construction and/or joint use of Air Force facilities. At six locations, the units are utilizing substandard World War II type facilities. The remaining nine locations have not yet been provided all facilities desired.

FORCE STRUCTURE (INDIVIDUALS)

In addition to the unit program, we also have a requirement to train an additional augmentation force of reservists in the individual training program. Individual training is provided by (1) job proficiency training, (2) special tours of duty, (3) school training, (4) correspondence courses, and (5) Air Reserve center training.

The program as presented today does not include funds for the construction of facilities for the individual training program. The 82 centers are utilizing permanent-type buildings and Government owned and/or operated facilities. Where this is not feasible, commercially leased facilities have been acquired. Construction of future Air Reserve centers will be programed only when it is determined that such construction meets the best interest of the Government.

STATUS OF CURRENT YEARS' FUNDING

In prior years, funds for construction of facilities for the Air Force Reserve program were included in the appropriation, "Military construction, Air Force." Since this is the first year of operating under the new appropriation, "Military construction, Air Force Reserve," I would like to comment briefly on the progress being made with the funds appropriated in fiscal year 1960, under this new account. Funds in the amount of $4 million were appropriated for the construction of 15 urgently required projects at 8 flying locations. Of this amount, $2 million was obligated the end of February.

FISCAL YEAR 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION PROGRAM

The program being presented today requests an additional $4 million for military construction. Of this amount $150,000 is requested for advance project planning and $150,000 for minor construction.

This latter amount will finance minor construction projects which are urgently required and cannot await inclusion in a subsequent military construction program. Like the active establishment our experience in recent years has indicated an increasing need for this capability in order to utilize existing funds and readily respond to mission changes or aircraft conversions dictated by defense policies or changes in requirements. Projects developed under this program will be administered in the same manner as they are in the active establishment and the same criteria and ground rules will apply.

The remaining amount of $3,700,000 is required for a Reserve hangar at Dobbins AFB, Ga., a hangar and supply warehouse at Dallas NAS, Tex., and airfield pavement at Ellington AFB, Tex.

STATUS OF PRIOR YEARS' PROGRAMS

From 1951 to the present, $81,400,000 has been authorized for Air Force Reserve construction, and $80,800,000 appropriated. We estimate that $79,900,000 of this amount will be obligated by the end of this fiscal year.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, gentlemen, I wish to assure the committee that satisfactory progress is being made in the Reserve construction program. The Department of the Air Force believes that with the assistance that Congress and the Department of Defense is giving us, our Air Force Reserve will be able to carry out their assigned D-day mission in the same outstanding manner as they always have in the past during times of national need.

Gentlemen, this concludes my presentation. I am ready to provide you with any further information you may desire.

SUMMARY STATEMENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record the summary pages of the justifications.

(The summary pages follow:)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

Program and appropriation request

Program 310. Planning	$150,000
Program 320. Inside United States	3,794,000
Program 340. Minor construction	150,000
Total	4,094,000
Appropriation request	4,000,000

Program 310. Planning, $150,000

Part I. Purpose and scope.—The funds estimated in this program are to provide financing as required for site selection, initial base master plans, and advance project planning for the construction requirements of the Air Force Reserve.

Part II. Justification of funds requested.—The funds required for advance project planning ($150,000) will provide for establishing project planning reports and final design for facilities, and to achieve full evaluation of each project in terms of technical adequacy and estimated cost. The funds will also provide for any site surveys, or development of initial base master plans that may be required.

Program 320. Reserve Forces construction, $3,794,000

Part I. Purpose and scope.—The funds estimated in this program are required to finance military construction for the Air Force Reserve, inside the United States.

Part II. Justification of funds requested.—The three locations, for which funding is being requested, are as follows:

Installation	Item	Command	Appropriation request
Dallas NAS	Hangar, Reserve Forces	CNR	$1,759,000
Dallas NAS	Warehouse, supply and equipment base.	CNR	233,000
Dobbins AFB	Hangar, Reserve Forces	CNR	1,268,000
Ellington AFB	Airfield pavements	CNR	534,000
Total			3,794,000

Program 340. Minor construction, $150,000

Part I. Purpose and scope.—The funds estimated in this program are to provide financing for those projects not otherwise authorized by law.

Part II. Justification of funds requested.—The funds required for minor construction ($150,000) will provide for those unforeseen projects arising during the course of the year in which the urgency is such that they cannot await inclusion in the next regular military construction program for the Air Force Reserve. Authority for construction of these projects is contained in chapter 133, title 10, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there questions?

The gentleman on my right?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, you are also excused.

This committee now will stand adjourned.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1960.

NAVAL RESERVE

WITNESSES

REAR ADM. H. A. RENKEN, DIRECTOR, SHORE STATION CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

REAR ADM. EUGENE J. PELTIER, CEC, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

CAPT. GEORGE F. VANCE, HEAD, RESERVE TRAINING STATIONS BRANCH, BUREAU OF WEAPONS (NAVAL RESERVE AVIATION)

CAPT. JOHN W. M. MONTGOMERY, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF STAFF OFFICER, OFFICE OF NAVY COMPTROLLER

COMDR. JAMES V. BARTLETT, CEC, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT STAFF, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

COMDR. I. L. SWOPE, ASSISTANT FOR NAVAL RESERVE BUDGET AND FACILITIES, NAVAL RESERVE PLANS DIVISION, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

COMDR. GEORGE M. McGEE, OPNAV–(OP44), SHORE STATION MAINTENANCE AND DEVELOPMENT SECTION, AVIATION AND RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

WILFRED P. TIENCKEN, SENIOR REAL ESTATE CONSULTANT, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

COMDR. A. P. MINWEGEN, CEC, U.S. NAVY, STAFF OFFICER FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, OFFICE OF NAVY COMPTROLLER

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct obligations:			
1. Public works construction	$10,080,439	$9,875,000	$6,125,000
2. Minor construction	525,814	600,000	450,000
3. Planning	213,124	525,000	425,000
Total direct obligations	10,819,377	11,000,000	7,000,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
1. Public works construction	518	3,000	
Total obligations	10,819,895	11,003,000	7,000,000
Financing:			
Unobligated balance brought forward	−12,464,441	−9,645,064	−7,625,064
Advances and reimbursements from non-Federal sources (no statute)	−518	−3,000	
Unobligated balance carried forward	9,645,064	7,625,064	4,625,064
Appropriation (new obligational authority)	8,000,000	8,980,000	4,000,000

Object classification

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE			
Total number of permanent positions	35		
Average number of all employees	35		
Number of employees at end of year	0		
Average GS grade and salary	7.3 $6,125		
Direct obligations:			
01 Personal services: Permanent positions	$223,200		
02 Travel	34,108		
03 Transportation of things	388		
04 Communication services	7,353		
05 Rents and utility services	2,460		
06 Printing and reproduction	5,754		
07 Other contractual services	429,282	$700,000	$650,000
08 Supplies and materials	226,614	225,000	175,000
09 Equipment	193,022	132,000	132,000
10 Lands and structures	9,123,067	9,599,460	6,043,000
11 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	13,844		
15 Taxes and assessments	1,125		
Total direct obligations	10,260,217	10,656,460	7,000,000
Reimbursable obligations:			
07 Other contractual services	518	3,000	
Total, Navy	10,260,735	10,659,460	7,000,000
ALLOCATION TO BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
10 Lands and structures	559,160	343,540	
Total obligations	10,819,895	11,003,000	7,000,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall insert in the record the statement of Admiral Renken.

STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. H. A. RENKEN, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR, SHORE STATION CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, IN SUPPORT OF THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE FORCES FISCAL YEAR 1961 FUNDING PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today in support of the military construction, Naval Reserve Forces program, which is so vital to the training and effectiveness of our Reserve components.

In the years 1946 through 1952, the Navy and the Marine Corps reestablished their Reserve programs. Facilities to support these programs were acquired

in some 500 locations throughout the States where interest and population were estimated to justify the establishment of Reserve units. These areas were all canvassed carefully to determine if existing facilities, either of prewar construction or World War II surplus, were available and could be utilized to provide the needed training facilities. In communities where such facilities could not be otherwise acquired, the Congress authorized funds to erect armories utilizing war surplus quonset or Butler buildings to provide the majority of the needed interior space and a connecting headhouse to provide additional space and an acceptable frontal view. Some of the facilities utilized were on long-term lease and some of the quonset type armories were constructed on leased land.

Training centers supporting 200 to 1,500 reservists each were established in the larger communities as the population potential warranted. In smaller communities and, wherever possible, in close proximity to colleges or universities where the caliber of recruits could be expected to be higher, we established electronics facilities, whose primary purpose was to train the technical personnel so essential to the electronics and related fields.

Since that time, changes in equipment, training techniques, and operational requirements have necessitate changes to, or replacement of, facilities thus acquired. Additionally, some leases then entered into are expiring and cannot be renewed, while useful service from any wartime structures is rapidly reaching an end. Thus the program of modernization and replacement of training and operational facilities is mandatory if the Reserve programs are to continue to function effectively.

It is our purpose to insure that a clear need exists for items in the program presented for your approval. To that end the program before you has been repeatedly screened to insure that only items of the greatest urgency are included therein.

As a result of favorable contract award prices plus cancellation of previously approved items for which requirements no longer exists, we estimate savings in the amount of $3 million will have been accumulated by June 30, 1960. To support our requirement for a total funding program of $7 million for fiscal year 1961, we are requesting $4 million in new obligational authority.

For purposes of clarity our requests for line item funding, which totals $6,450,000, has been divided into three parts—namely, Naval Reserve aviation, Naval Reserve surface, and Marine Corps Reserve ground. With your permission we will present them in that order.

The Naval Reserve aviation segment (which includes requirements for Marine Corps Reserve aviation) provides the facilities needed to support over 300 air squadrons at 13 Reserve air stations and 5 Naval Air Reserve training units situated on regular air stations. About one-half of these squadrons are being trained to perform around-the-clock antisubmarine missions immediately on M-day. As such, they require modern, all-weather operational and training facilities comparable to those required by active fleet units. The program before you requests authorization for aircraft-landing aids, safety improvements to operational facilities, and replacement of two 20-year-old wooden buildings required for training and housekeeping support.

The Naval Reserve surface program provides facilities for the training of personnel required by mobilization plans. It additionally provides, in areas where other Navy facilities are lacking, the shore facilities needed in support of our selected Reserve ships. In 1961 the facilities supporting the Naval Reserve program will be situated at 458 locations throughout the country. To meet the needs of this program we are requesting replacement of 2 training centers and 14 electronics facilities, plus rehabilitation of 2 centers and additional classrooms for another.

The Marine Corps Reserve ground segment of the program provides facilities for the training of personnel to immediately augment the Fleet Marine Ground Forces. There are planned for 1961, 225 facilities for this purpose, most of which are combined with the Naval Reserve training centers. We are requesting joint construction with the Naval Reserve at the two replacement training centers mentioned above, plus the purchase of one Marine Corps Reserve training center now in use.

We are requesting an additional $550,000 to provide for the planning and architectural services required in conjunction with the overall program, plus minor new construction, replacement of damaged facilities, and emergency construction, as may be necessary.

Gentlemen, this concludes my statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will insert in the record the statement of Admiral Peltier.

STATEMENT BY REAR ADM. E. J. PELTIER, CEC, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I would like to report briefly on the current status of the construction program.

At the beginning of fiscal year 1960 we had an unobligated appropriation of $9.6 million. To this was added $9 million of new obligating authority, making a total of $18.6 million available during fiscal year 1960. We will obligate $11 million of this, leaving at the end of fiscal year 1960, an unobligated appropriation of $7.6 million. Of this amount, $4.6 million will be committed to complete work in progress and $3 million will be uncommitted.

The $4 million of new obligating authority currently being requested when added to the $7.6 million carried over will give us a total of $11.6 million of obligating authority for fiscal year 1961. Our program for fiscal year 1961 will consist of $6.4 million in new line items and $0.6 million of new continuing authorization currently being requested, plus the $4.6 million yet to be obligated to complete work in progress. This will give us a total program of $11.6 million. Thus, it is seen that the funds and the program are in balance.

I shall be present throughout these hearings and will be glad to provide such additional information concerning the Naval Reserve construction program as may be required.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATUS OF FUNDS AND PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we have a $4 million request for Naval Reserve. What is the unobligated balance as of your last reporting date?

Admiral PELTIER. Mr. Chairman, we have about $13.6 million unobligated as of right now. We have not really gotten underway on our 1960 program. Most of our obligations will be in the fourth quarter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will it not be a little rough to have that money out and have your design operations to the degree that you can put them out with some degree of determination?

Admiral PELTIER. We have been doing this for several years. Most of our obligations occur in this last period. Of the $7.6 million we will carry over, some will be committed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much will be uncommitted?

Admiral PELTIER. We will actually have an uncommitted balance of $3 million that we are carrying over into the next year. That is why we have such a low NOA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insert in the record tabulations similar to those found on pages 789 and 790 of last year's hearings. Also insert in the record the summary pages for "Aviation, surface and ground Reserve facilities."

(The information requested follows:)

In summary

	Millions
Estimated carryover of obligational authority into fiscal year 1961	$7.6
New obligational authority requested	4.0
Obligational authority available, fiscal year 1961	11.6
Planned obligations, fiscal year 1961	7.0
Estimated carryover of obligational authority into fiscal year 1962	4.6

Recapitulation of actual and estimated obligations for appropriation, "Military construction, Naval Reserve"

Type	Amount of original program, fiscal year 1954–58	Amount of funds applied, fiscal year 1954–60	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance, Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations, June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
Aviation	$87,659,720	$82,105,892	$57,533,851	$4,572,041	$1,986,940	$59,520,791	$2,585,101	$2,585,101	0
Surface	20,040,140	18,360,108	15,778,971	2,581,137	1,461,754	17,240,725	1,119,383	1,119,383	0
Ground	16,755,940	14,343,385	12,022,214	2,321,181	1,476,706	13,498,920	844,475	844,475	0
Various locations: Advance planning, minor construction, replace damaged facilities and emergency construction	2,190,043	1,940,043	934,791	1,005,252	929,147	1,863,938	76,105	76,105	0
Program savings		3,000,000	0	3,000,000	0	0	3,000,000	0	$3,000,000
Total program	126,644,943	99,749,438	86,269,827	13,479,611	5,854,547	92,124,374	7,625,064	4,625,064	3,000,000

Status of projects under appropriation, "Military construction, Naval Reserve" (aviation program)

Station	Amount of original program, fiscal year 1954–58	Amount of funds applied, fiscal year 1954–58	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance, Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations, June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
AVIATION									
NAS, Akron, Ohio	$39,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAS, Akron-Cleveland, Ohio	3,864,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAS, Atlanta, Ga	5,000,000	$5,478,611	$5,403,763	$74,848	$3,345	$5,407,108	$71,503	$71,503	0
NAS, Columbus, Ohio	1,049,920	743,451	729,668	13,783	5,783	735,451	8,000	8,000	0
NAS, Dallas, Tex	2,643,000	2,501,013	2,367,171	133,842	3,682	2,370,853	130,160	130,160	0
NAS, Denver, Colo	3,754,000	3,055,996	3,052,174	3,822	3,822	3,055,996	0	0	0
NAS, Glenview, Ill	770,000	677,530	663,509	14,021	7,118	670,627	6,903	6,903	0
NARF, Houston, Tex	1,179,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAS, Lincoln, Nebr	1,013,920	733,818	733,818	0	0	733,818	0	0	0
NAS, Los Alamitos, Calif	1,275,840	1,011,082	999,298	11,784	4,715	1,004,013	7,069	7,069	0
MCAS, Miami, Fla	325,000	150,502	144,955	5,547	5,547	150,502	0	0	0
NAS, Minneapolis, Minn	517,000	363,026	363,026	0	0	363,026	0	0	0
NAS, New Orleans, La	26,650,920	24,821,316	24,817,138	4,178	2,381	24,819,519	1,797	1,797	0
NAS, New York, N.Y	2,047,840	1,489,469	1,377,172	112,297	4,716	1,381,888	107,581	107,581	0
NAS, Niagara Falls, N.Y	1,976,000	2,049,039	2,034,687	14,352	4,352	2,039,039	10,000	10,000	0
NAS, Oakland, Calif	1,040,000	698,623	689,467	9,156	9,156	698,623	0	0	0
NAS, Olathe, Kans	1,998,000	798,917	795,940	2,977	2,977	798,917	0	0	0
NAS, Portland, Oreg	8,598,000	9,091	9,091	0	0	9,091	0	0	0
NAS, St. Louis, Mo	634,400	2,770	2,770	0	0	2,770	0	0	0
NAS, Seattle, Wash	204,000	89,547	89,547	0	0	89,547	0	0	0
NAS, So. Weymouth, Mass	7,625,440	6,143,850	5,796,002	347,848	1,000	5,797,002	346,848	346,848	0
NAS, Willow Grove, Pa	3,618,440	3,039,368	2,980,276	59,092	400	2,980,676	58,692	58,692	0
Total, aviation program	75,823,720	53,857,019	53,049,472	807,547	58,994	53,108,466	748,553	748,553	0

Status of projects under appropriation, "Military construction, Naval Reserve" (surface program)

Station	Amount of original program, fiscal year 1954–58	Amount of funds applied, fiscal year 1954–58	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance, Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations, June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
SURFACE									
N&MCRTC, Akron, Ohio	$592,320	$481,649	$481,649	0	0	$481,649	0	0	0
NA&MCRTC, Albany, N.Y	520,000	442,910	442,910	0	0	442,910	0	0	0
NREF, Anderson, S.C	49,000	53,178	53,178	0	0	53,178	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Atlanta, Ga	592,000	570,912	570,763	$149	$149	570,912	0	0	0
NRTC, Boston, Mass	34,900	35,345	35,345	0	0	35,345	0	0	0
NRTC, Brockton, Mass	200	181	181	0	0	181	0	0	0
NREF, Brownwood, Tex	56,000	61,286	60,482	804	804	61,286	0	0	0
NREF, Carlsbad, N. Mex	44,000	64,753	64,753	0	0	64,753	0	0	0
NRTC, Cedar Rapids, Iowa	273,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Chicago, Ill	1,241,280	651,507	651,507	0	0	651,507	0	0	0
NREF, Clarkston, Wash	32,400	34,207	34,207	0	0	34,207	0	0	0
NRTC, Clifton, N.J	109,000	15,598	15,598	0	0	15,598	0	0	0
NREF, Crowley, La	58,000	64,905	63,975	930	930	64,905	0	0	0
NREF, Curwensville, Pa	95,000	108,800	108,575	225	225	108,800	0	0	0
NRTC, Danville, Ky	71,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NRTC, Davenport, Iowa	8,000	5,913	5,913	0	0	5,913	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Dayton, Ohio	600,960	539,693	539,693	0	0	539,693	0	0	0
NREF, Dinuba, Calif	100,000	96,921	95,558	1,363	1,363	96,921	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Eddystone, Pa	607,000	578,226	566,404	11,822	11,822	578,226	0	0	0
N&ARTC, Elmira, N.Y	315,000	300,610	300,610	0	0	300,610	0	0	0
NREF, Emporia, Kans	60,000	75,849	75,849	0	0	75,849	0	0	0
NREF, Eureka, Calif	42,000	46,670	46,670	0	0	46,670	0	0	0
NRTC, Florence, S.C	69,000	65,620	65,620	0	0	65,620	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Fort Schuyler, N.Y	756,000	818,284	609,590	208,694	53,085	662,675	$155,609	$155,609	0
NREF, Great Falls, Mont	63,000	67,348	67,348	0	0	67,348	0	0	0
NRTC, Hancock, Mich	49,000	44,134	44,134	0	0	44,134	0	0	0
NREF, Hattiesburg, Miss	28,000	34,887	34,887	0	0	34,887	0	0	0
N&ARTC, Hutchinson, Kans	440,640	297,558	297,558	0	0	297,558	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Kansas City, Mo	727,000	632,455	632,455	0	0	632,455	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Louisville, Ky	610,000	619,860	609,657	10,203	5,203	614,860	5,000	5,000	0
NREF, Malden, Mass	88,000	861	861	0	0	861	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Manchester, Mass	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NRTC, McKeesport, Pa	80,000	83,222	81,585	1,637	1,637	83,222	0	0	0
NREF, Miami, Ariz	42,000	38,273	38,273	0	0	38,273	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Milwaukee, Wis	606,720	694,024	694,024	0	0	694,024	0	0	0
NREF, Modesto, Calif	42,000	41,145	41,145	0	0	41,145	0	0	0
NREF, Monroe, La	44,000	56,740	56,740	0	0	56,740	0	0	0
NRTC, New Bedford, Mass	513,000	496,488	496,377	111	111	496,488	0	0	0

Status of projects under appropriation, "Military construction, Naval Reserve" (surface program)—Continued

Station	Amount of original program, fiscal year 1954–58	Amount of funds applied, fiscal year 1954–58	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance, Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations, June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
SURFACE—continued									
NREF, Paducah, Ky	$66,000	$72,600	$71,612	$988	$988	$72,600	0	0	0
NREF, Parsons, Kans	60,000	71,233	71,233	0	0	71,233	0	0	0
NRTC, Peoria, Ill	23,800	22,085	22,021	64	64	22,085	0	0	0
NREF, Petaluma, Calif	61,000	55,272	54,910	362	362	55,272	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Pittsburgh, Pa	707,280	791,288	791,288	0	0	791,288	0	0	0
NRTC, Pomona, Calif	689,000	679,568	623,546	56,022	21,845	645,391	$34,177	$34,177	0
N&MCRTC, Port Arthur, Tex	38,600	56,408	56,408	0	0	56,408	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Quincy-Hingham, Mass	499,200	540,072	531,935	8,137	8,137	540,072	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Raleigh, N.C	467,000	393,184	365,625	27,559	5,000	370,625	22,559	22,559	0
N&MCRTC, Reading, Pa	537,000	576,792	571,014	5,778	5,778	576,792	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, St. Louis, Mo	103,680	93,876	93,876	0	0	93,876	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, San Francisco, Calif	92,160	79,720	79,720	0	0	79,720	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, San Jose, Calif	112,000	357	357	0	0	357	0	0	0
NRTC, San Pedro, Calif	38,000	33,900	33,900	0	0	33,900	0	0	0
NREF, Santa Maria, Calif	37,000	68,764	66,692	2,072	2,072	68,764	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Seattle, Wash	496,000	538,408	537,330	1,078	1,078	538,408	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Steubenville, Ohio	13,000	502	502	0	0	502	0	0	0
NRTC, Stockton, Calif	22,000	16,053	16,053	0	0	16,053	0	0	0
NREF, Tallahassee, Fla	38,000	39,804	39,804	0	0	39,804	0	0	0
NREF, Tyler, Tex	52,000	60,256	60,256	0	0	60,256	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Waco, Tex	422,000	321,337	321,337	0	0	321,337	0	0	0
NREF, Washington, N.C	58,000	63,757	63,750	7	7	63,757	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Wilmington, Del	616,000	658,124	642,040	16,084	6,079	648,119	10,005	10,005	0
NREF, Winter Haven, Fla	37,000	39,801	39,801	0	0	39,801	0	0	0
NRTC, Woonsocket, R.I	200	181	181	0	0	181	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Worcester, Mass	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total, surface projects	14,945,140	13,493,354	13,139,265	354,089	126,739	13,266,004	227,350	227,350	0

Status of projects under appropriation "Military construction, Naval Reserve (ground program)"

Station	Amount of original program, fiscal year 1954–58	Amount of funds applied, fiscal year 1954–58	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance, Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations, June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
GROUND									
NRTC, Abilene, Tex	$110,400	$72,629	$72,629	0	0	$72,629	0	0	0
NRTC, Akron, Ohio	179,529	178,718	178,718	0	0	178,718	0	0	0
ANMCRTC, Albany, N.Y	123,000	83,410	83,410	0	0	83,410	0	0	0
NRTC, Amarillo, Tex	110,400	66,988	66,988	0	0	66,988	0	0	0
MCRTC, Arlington, Va	535,000	887	887	0	0	887	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Atlanta, Ga	317,000	282,102	282,102	0	0	282,102	0	0	0
MCRTC, Atlantic City, N.J	120,000	123,314	123,314	0	0	123,314	0	0	0
NRTC, Aurora, Ill	110,400	63,559	63,559	0	0	63,559	0	0	0
MCRTC, Baltimore, Md	767,000	767,039	753,169	$13,870	$8,870	762,039	$5,000	$5,000	0
MCRTC, Charlotte, N.C	154,000	141,559	141,559	0	0	141,559	0	0	0
NRTC, Chicago, Ill	234,240	197,497	197,497	0	0	197,497	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Columbia, S.C	164,000	96,662	96,662	0	0	96,662	0	0	0
NRTC, Danville, Ill	110,400	66,687	66,687	0	0	66,687	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Dayton, Ohio	142,080	131,853	131,853	0	0	131,853	0	0	0
NRTC, Des Moines, Iowa	102,720	78,414	78,414	-	-	78,414	-	-	-
MCRTC, Durham, N.C	53,000	46,970	46,970	0	0	46,970	0	0	0
MCRTC, Eddystone, Pa	163,000	159,906	159,334	572	572	159,906	0	0	0
NRTC, El Paso, Tex	135,360	92,190	92,190	0	0	92,190	0	0	0
MCRTC, Erie, Pa	190,000	150,585	150,585	0	0	150,585	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Engine, Oreg	28,000	20,444	20,444	0	0	20,444	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Fort Schuyler, N.Y	432,000	455,258	377,780	77,478	25,000	402,780	52,478	52,478	0
NRTC, Fort Smith, Ark	110,400	75,777	75,777	0	0	75,777	0	0	0
MCRTC, Forty-Fort, Pa	285,000	273,344	267,896	5,448	5,448	273,344	0	0	0
MCRTC, Freemansburg, Pa	200,000	190,675	190,675	0	0	190,675	0	0	0
NRTC, Freeport, N.Y	135,360	130,890	130,890	0	0	130,890	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Fresno, Calif	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MCRTC, Garden City, N.Y	73,000	60,848	58,640	2,208	2,208	60,848	0	0	0
NRTC, Gary, Ind	110,400	60,777	60,777	0	0	60,777	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Grand Rapids, Mich	82,000	66,635	66,635	0	0	66,635	0	0	0
NRTC, Hamilton, Ohio	110,400	83,341	83,341	0	0	83,341	0	0	0
NRTC, Hartford, Conn	110,400	103,476	103,476	0	0	103,476	0	0	0
MCRTC, Houston, Tex	450,500	585,050	574,523	10,527	5,527	580,050	5,000	5,000	0
NRTC, Jackson, Mich	110,400	64,553	64,553	0	0	64,553	0	0	0
MCRTC, Jackson, Miss	129,000	125,086	125,086	0	0	125,086	0	0	0
MCR, Jacksonville, Fla	79,000	82,780	82,780	0	0	82,780	0	0	0
NRTC, Joplin, Mo	110,400	69,585	69,585	0	0	69,585	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Kansas City, Mo	279,000	231,074	231,074	0	0	231,074	0	0	0
MCRTC, Kentfield, Calif	89,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Status of projects under appropriation "Military construction, Naval Reserve (ground program)"—Continued

Station	Amount of original program, fiscal year 1954–58	Amount of funds applied, fiscal year 1954–58	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance, Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations, June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
GROUND—continued									
NRTC, Lacrosse, Wis	$110,400	$63,083	$83,083	0	0	$63,083	0	0	0
MCRTC, Lewiston, Maine	81,000	104,296	104,296	0	0	104,296	0	0	0
NRTC, Lima, Ohio	110,400	73,886	73,886	0	0	73,886	0	0	0
NRTC, Lincoln, Nebr	109,440	56,971	56,971	0	0	56,971	0	0	0
NRTC, Lorain, Ohio	109,440	85,146	85,146	0	0	85,146	0	0	0
MCR, Louisville, Ky	150,000	149,627	147,304	2,323	2,323	149,627	0	0	0
ANMCRTC, Macon, Ga	128,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NRTC, Manchester, N.H	135,360	83,875	83,875	0	0	83,875	0	0	0
NRRC, Mansfield, Ohio	109,440	73,080	73,080	0	0	73,080	0	0	0
MCRTC, Miami, Fla	375,000	379,704	379,704	0	0	379,704	0	0	0
NRTC, Milwaukee, Wis	219,840	167,069	167,069	0	0	167,069	0	0	0
NRTC, Muskegon, Mich	109,440	75,735	75,735	0	0	75,735	0	0	0
MCRTC, New Castle, Pa	60,000	61,976	60,854	1,122	1,122	61,976	0	0	0
MCR, New Orleans, La	140,000	137,140	137,140	0	0	137,140	0	0	0
MCRTC, Newport News, Va	101,000	106,265	106,265	0	0	106,265	0	0	0
NRTC, Oshkosh, Wis	109,440	59,524	59,524	0	0	59,524	0	0	0
A&MCRTC, Pico, Calif	410,000	411,064	402,761	8,303	8,303	411,064	0	0	0
NRTC, Pittsburgh, Pa	219,840	218,750	218,750	0	0	218,750	0	0	0
MCRTC, Portland, Maine	254,000	279,351	277,019	2,332	2,332	279,351	0	0	0
NRTC, Portsmouth, Ohio	109,440	102,342	102,342	0	0	102,342	0	0	0
NRTC, Pueblo, Colo	109,440	65,643	65,643	0	0	65,643	0	0	0
NRTC, Quincy-Hingham, Mass	107,520	107,214	105,655	1,559	1,559	107,214	0	0	0
NCRTC, Raleigh, N.C	166,000	143,508	143,508	0	0	143,508	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Reading, Pa	212,000	211,422	207,428	3,994	3,994	211,422	0	0	0
MCR, Rochester, N.Y	79,000	79,000	73,035	5,965	5,965	79,000	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Salem, Oreg	28,000	20,541	20,541	0	0	20,541	0	0	0
NRTC, Salt Lake City, Utah	234,240	130,766	130,766	0	0	130,766	0	0	0
NRTC, San Angelo, Tex	110,400	76,204	76,204	0	0	76,204	0	0	0
MCR, San Jose, Calif	99,500	85,597	85,591	6	6	85,597	0	0	0
MCRTC, Santa Monica, Calif	70,000	69,507	69,507	0	0	69,507	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Springfield, Ill	163,000	84,043	84,043	0	0	84,043	0	0	0
NRTC, Steubenville, Ohio	109,440	101,839	101,839	0	0	101,839	0	0	0
MCRTC, St. Joseph, Mo	14,400	15,501	15,501	0	0	15,501	0	0	0
MCRTC, Syracuse, N.Y	102,000	124,693	124,693	0	0	124,693	0	0	0
NRTC, Terre Haute, Ind	109,440	52,003	52,003	0	0	52,003	0	0	0
MCRTC, Texarkana, Tex	302,000	311,000	289,073	21,927	3,506	292,579	18,421	18,421	0
NRTC, Trenton, N.J	154,560	148,154	148,154	0	0	148,154	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Waco, Tex	224,000	177,032	177,032	0	0	177,032	0	0	0

N&MCRTC, Waco, Tex	224, 000	177, 032	177, 032	0	0	177, 032	0	0	0
NRTC, Wheeeling, W. Va	106, 560	75, 723	75, 723	0	0	75, 723	0	0	0
MCR, Wichita, Kans	76, 000	66, 992	66, 992	0	0	66, 992	0	0	0
NRTC, Wichita Falls, Tex	110, 400	84, 363	84, 363	0	0	84, 363	0	0	0
NRTC, Williamsport, Pa	109, 440	98, 729	98, 729	0	0	98, 729	0	0	0
MCR, Wilmington, Del	174, 000	192, 513	187, 462	5, 051	5, 051	192, 513	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Winston-Salem, N.C	181, 000	102, 381	102, 381	0	0	102, 381	0	0	0
NRTC, Zanesville, Ohio	109, 440	74, 559	74, 599	0	0	74, 559	0	0	0
MCRTC, Yakima, Wash	281, 000	302, 000	280, 832	21, 168	6, 000	286, 832	15, 168	15, 168	0
Total, ground projects	13, 590, 040	11, 170, 373	10, 986, 520	183, 853	87, 786	11, 074, 306	96, 067	96, 067	0

Status of projects authorized by Public Law 685, 85th Cong. (aviation program), appropriation "Military construction, Naval Reserve"

Location and description	Amount of original program	Amount of funds applied	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
AVIATION									
NAS, Atlanta, Ga.: Technical training building	$480,000	$365,695	$332,213	$33,482	$3,442	$335,655	$30,040	$30,040	0
NAS, Dallas, Tex.:									
Aircraft ready fuel storage	160,000	120,196	114,386	5,810	0	114,386	5,810	5,810	0
Standby generator plant	99,000	67,925	65,068	2,857	0	65,068	2,857	2,857	0
NAS, Denver, Colo.:									
Tower removal and land acquisition	155,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public works and transportation facilities	398,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Standby generator plant	99,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAS, Glenview, Ill.:									
Optical landing system	80,000	51,940	50,616	1,324	1,324	51,940	0	0	0
Standby generator plant	99,000	50,527	47,739	2,788	0	47,739	2,788	2,788	0
NAS, Grosse Ile, Mich.: Runway and taxiway lighting	147,000	79,269	73,421	5,848	1,848	75,269	4,000	4,000	0
NAS, Los Alamitos, Calif.:									
Land acquisition and easement	975,000	972,563	561,948	410,615	0	561,948	410,615	410,615	0
Improve aircraft parking area	763,000	392,640	381,196	11,444	2,044	383,240	9,400	9,400	0
Modernize aviation fuel storage	31,000	34,787	33,681	1,106	0	33,681	1,106	1,106	0
Approach lighting	113,000	40,077	31,083	8,994	0	31,083	8,994	8,994	0
Squadron operations building	110,000	89,311	66,254	23,057	0	66,254	23,057	23,057	0
NAS, New Orleans, La.:									
Tactical air navigation facility	41,000	62,467	59,491	2,976	976	60,467	2,000	2,000	0
Optical landing system	82,000	28,115	27,193	922	922	28,115	0	0	0
Squadron operations building	125,000	165,723	141,158	24,565	8,565	149,723	16,000	16,000	0
Fueling wharf and land acquisition	463,000	395,699	375,439	20,260	6,260	381,699	14,000	14,000	0
Jet engine test cell	366,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jet fuel storage	522,000	417,153	397,288	19,865	8,865	406,153	11,000	11,000	0
Administration building	368,000	323,809	277,124	46,685	6,685	283,809	40,000	40,000	0
Auditorium and gymnasium	480,000	292,110	277,000	15,110	5,110	282,110	10,000	10,000	0
NAS, New York, N.Y.: Approach lighting	130,000	143,454	102,063	41,391	1,391	103,454	40,000	40,000	0
NAS, Niagara Falls, N.Y.:									
Extension of runway	553,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Standby generator plant	99,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAS, Olathe, Kans.: Shoulder and end zone stabilization	570,000	602,567	574,812	27,755	755	575,567	27,000	27,000	0
NAS, South Weymouth, Mass.: Extend underground steam line	407,000	38,414	24,900	13,514	1,245	26,145	12,269	12,269	0
NAS, Willow Grove, Pa.: Standby generator plant	99,000	53,632	51,078	2,554	0	51,078	2,554	2,554	0
Total, aviation projects	8,014,000	4,788,073	4,065,151	722,922	49,432	4,114,583	673,490	673,490	0

plant	99,000	53,632	51,078	2,554	0	51,078	0	0	0
Total, aviation projects	8,014,000	4,788,073	4,065,151	722,922	49,432	4,114,583	673,490	673,490	0

Status of projects authorized by Public Law 685, 85th Cong. (surface program) appropriation "Military construction, Naval Reserve"

Location and description	Amount of original program	Amount of funds applied	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
SURFACE									
N&MCRTC, Alameda, Calif.: Rehabilitation of berthing pier	$128,000	$125,993	$125,993	0	0	$125,993	0	0	0
NREF, Bloomington, Ind.: Training building	95,000	66,000	44,520	$21,480	$2,505	47,025	$18,975	$18,975	0
NRTC, Boston, Mass.: Alterations to training building	108,000	35,345	35,345	0	0	35,345	0	0	0
NREF, Centralia, Wash.: Training building	81,000	79,189	79,189	0	0	79,189	0	0	0
NREF, Chillicothe, Ohio: Training building	100,000	82,318	65,938	16,380	2,964	68,902	13,416	13,416	0
NREF, Danville, Ky.: Training building	84,000	80,507	72,847	7,660	2,186	75,033	5,474	5,474	0
NRTC, Dunkirk, N.Y.: Antenna, poles and wire	79,000	90,850	69,348	21,502	10,427	79,775	11,075	11,075	0
N&MCRTC, Fort Schuyler, N.Y.: Rehabilitation of berthing pier	120,000	138,000	138,000	0	0	138,000	0	0	0
NREF, Hayward, Calif.: Training building and land acquisition	99,000	108,900	104,581	4,319	2,319	106,900	2,000	2,000	0
N&MCRTC, Honolulu, Hawaii: Training center	515,000	592,250	546,917	45,333	20,300	567,217	25,033	25,033	0
NREF, Iowa City, Iowa: Training building	97,000	58,422	45,861	12,561	3,681	49,542	8,880	8,880	0
N&MCRS, New Orleans, La.: Training building	210,000	210,000	197,973	12,027	1,740	199,713	10,287	10,287	0
NREF, Olympia, Wash.: Addition to training building	47,000	19,923	18,952	971	971	19,923	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Pasadena, Calif.: Addition to training building	132,000	112,461	106,165	6,296	1,296	107,461	5,000	5,000	0
NREF, Port Chicago, Calif.: Training building	94,000	99,800	98,785	1,015	1,015	99,800	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, San Jose, Calif.: Land acquisition	78,000	57,768	48,380	9,388	4,388	52,768	5,000	5,000	0
NRTC, St. Petersburg, Fla.: Rehabilitation of berthing pier	26,000	26,099	26,099	0	0	26,099	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Steubenville, Ohio: Land acquisition	18,000	16,594	15,325	1,269	1,269	16,594	0	0	0
NRTC, White Oak, Md.: Training center	557,000	515,735	362,084	153,651	45,118	407,202	108,533	108,533	0
NREF, Yakima, Wash.: Addition to training building	48,000	21,000	9,315	11,685	4,000	13,315	7,685	7,685	0
Total, surface projects	2,716,000	2,537,154	2,211,617	325,537	104,179	2,315,796	221,358	221,358	0

Status of projects authorized by Public Law 685, 85th Cong. (ground program), appropriation "Military construction, Naval Reserve"

Location and description	Amount of original program	Amount of funds applied	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Unobligated balance Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations Apr. 1 to June 30, 1960	Estimated cumulative obligations June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
GROUND									
MCRTC, Lynchburg, Va.: Training center and land acquisition	$388,000	$388,000	$346,170	$41,830	$15,000	$361,170	$26,830	$26,830	0
MCRTC, Memphis, Tenn.: Training center	453,000	453,000	496	452,504	317,000	317,496	135,504	135,504	0
N&MCRTC, Moline, Ill.: Addition to training building	152,000	154,032	149,502	4,530	4,530	154,032	0	0	0
N&MCRTC, Pasadena, Calif.: Addition to training building	163,000	125,460	123,071	2,389	2,389	125,460	0	0	0
Total, ground projects	1,156,000	1,120,492	619,239	501,253	338,919	958,158	162,334	162,334	0
Total, Public Law 685, 85th Cong., authorized projects	11,886,000	8,445,719	6,896,007	1,549,712	492,530	7,388,537	1,057,182	1,057,182	0

Status of projects authorized by Public Law 149, 86th Cong. (aviation program) appropriation "Military construction, Naval Reserve"

Location and description	Amount of original program	Amount of funds applied	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1, to June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
AVIATION							
NAS, Atlanta, Ga.:							
Addition to aircraft parking apron	$502,000	$502,000	0	$241,000	$261,000	$261,000	0
Optical landing system	55,000	55,000	$19,288	19,212	16,500	16,500	0
Cold storage and drugstores building	55,000	55,000	45,850	2,295	6,855	6,855	0
Covered storage shed	49,000	49,000	23,950	2,500	22,550	22,550	0
Navy exchange building	80,000	80,000	0	56,000	24,000	24,000	0
Standby generator plant	97,000	97,000	52,975	2,650	41,375	41,375	0
NAS, Dallas, Tex.:							
Liquid oxygen transfer building	46,000	50,600	0	35,400	15,200	15,200	0
Transmitter building	239,000	262,900	0	167,000	95,900	95,900	0
Alteration and repairs to hangar	63,000	69,300	0	48,500	20,800	20,800	0
NAS, Glenview, Ill.: Compass rose	59,000	59,000	0	41,400	17,600	17,600	0
NAS, Ile, Mich.:							
Optical landing system	57,000	57,000	0	39,200	17,800	17,800	0
Fire protection and sprinkler system	714,000	714,000	0	485,240	228,760	228,760	0
NAS, Los Alamitos, Calif.:							
Liquid oxygen transfer building	46,000	50,600	27,433	2,500	20,667	20,667	0
Aircraft arresting gear	150,000	163,600	0	104,000	59,600	59,600	0
Warehouse	339,000	----------	0	0	0	0	0
Waterline	28,000	30,800	0	21,500	9,300	9,300	0
NAS, New Orleans, La.:							
Liquid oxygen transfer building	56,000	50,600	0	39,200	11,400	11,400	0
Addition to transportation facility	122,000	99,400	0	85,500	13,900	13,900	0
NAS, Olathe, Kans.:							
Compass rose	42,000	42,000	0	29,400	12,600	12,600	0
Aircraft arresting gear	150,000	150,000	0	105,000	45,000	45,000	0
NAS, South Weymouth, Mass.:							
Approach lighting	76,000	80,000	0	56,000	24,000	24,000	0
NAS, Willow Grove, Pa.:							
Extension of taxiway	251,000	197,000	179,900	15,000	2,100	2,100	0
Compass rose	50,000	50,000	37,400	3,395	9,205	9,205	0
Liquid oxygen transfer building	46,000	46,000	32,432	1,622	11,946	11,946	0
Approach lighting	82,000	82,000	0	57,000	25,000	25,000	0
Aircraft arresting gear	150,000	150,000	0	105,000	45,000	45,000	0
Dispensary	218,000	218,000	0	113,000	105,000	105,000	0
Total, aviation projects	3,822,000	3,460,800	419,228	1,878,514	1,163,058	1,163,058	0

Status of projects authorized by Public Law 149/86th Congress (surface and ground program) appropriation "Military Construction, Naval Reserve"

Location and description	Amount of original program	Amount of funds applied	Obligated as of Mar. 31, 1960	Estimated additional obligations, Apr. 1, to June 30, 1960	Estimated unobligated balance, June 30, 1960	Committed appropriation	Uncommitted appropriation
SURFACE							
N&MCRTC, Beaumont, Tex.: Rehabilitation of berthing wharf	$65,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
NREF, Champaign, Ill.: Training building	70,000	$70,000	$44,520	$5,355	$20,125	$20,125	0
NRTC, Cleveland, Ohio: Training center	655,000	655,000	0	430,000	225,000	225,000	0
N&MCRTC, Galveston, Tex.: Rehabilitation of berthing wharf	204,000	204,000	0	140,000	64,000	64,000	0
NREF, Kingsville, Tex.: Rehabilitation of training building	35,000	35,000	0	24,938	10,062	10,062	0
N&MCRTC, New Haven, Conn.: Berthing pier	323,000	323,000	273,800	1,003	48,197	48,197	0
N&MCRTC, St. Louis, Mo.: Training center	697,000	697,000	0	468,540	228,460	228,460	0
NRTC, San Diego, Calif.: Rehabilitation of berthing pier	226,000	226,000	0	160,000	66,000	66,000	0
NRTC, Whitestone, N.Y.: Rehabilitation of berthing pier	104,000	119,600	109,769	1,000	8,831	8,831	0
Total, surface projects	2,379,000	2,329,600	428,089	1,230,836	670,675	670,675	0
GROUND							
MCRTC, Chicago, Ill.: Training center	518,000	518,000	416,455	9,001	92,544	92,544	0
MCRTC, Johnson City, Tenn.: Training center and land acquisition	330,000	310,000	0	202,000	108,000	108,000	0
N&MCRTC, St. Louis, Mo.: Training center	370,000	370,000	0	250,000	120,000	120,000	0
MCRTC, San Rafael, Calif.: Training center	490,000	463,530	0	325,000	138,530	138,530	0
MCRTC, Tampa, Fla.: Training center	391,000	391,000	0	264,000	127,000	127,000	0
Total, ground	2,099,000	2,052,530	416,455	1,050,001	586,074	586,074	0
Total, Public Law 146, 86th Cong., authorized projects	8,300,000	7,842,930	1,263,772	4,159,351	2,419,807	2,419,807	0

The summary pages requested are as follows:

Military construction, Naval Reserve program, fiscal year 1961

NAVAL RESERVE, AVIATION

Installation and line item	*Appropriation request*
NAS, Dallas, Tex.: Runway lighting	$130,000
NAS, Glenview, Ill.:	
Overlay parking and taxi areas	967,000
Stabilization of runway shoulders and overruns (2d increment)	331,000
Total	1,298,000
NAS, Grosse Ile, Mich.: Aircraft arresting gear	150,000

Military construction, Naval Reserve program, fiscal year 1961—Continued

NAVAL RESERVE, AVIATION—continued

Installation and line item	*Appropriation request*
NAS, Los Alamitos, Calif.:	
Refrigeration and dry stores building	$97,000
Water line including land acquisition	209,000
Total	306,000
NAS, Minneapolis, Minn:	
Aircraft parking apron addition	129,000
Compass rose	49,000
Total	178,000
NAS, New York, N.Y.:	
Extension of taxiway	331,000
Aircraft arresting gear	140,000
Total	471,000
NAS, Olathe, Kans.: Stabilization of end zones	121,000
NAS, Seattle, Wash.: Aircraft arresting gear	181,000
NAS, South Weymouth, Mass.:	
Stabilization of end zones	118,000
Aircraft arresting gear	182,000
Total	300,000
NAS, Willow Grove, Pa.: Technical training building	575,000
Total, aviation	3,710,000

NAVAL RESERVE, SURFACE

NREF, Appleton, Wis.: Training building	$47,000
NREF, Auburn, Calif.: Training building	75,000
NRTC, Fort McHenry, Baltimore, Md.: Training center rehabilitation	300,000
NREF, Boulder, Colo.: Training building	56,000
NRTC, Brooklyn, N.Y.: Rehabilitation of training building	75,000
NREF, Corvallis, Oreg.: Training building	56,000
NREF, Eau Claire, Wis.: Training building	55,000
NREF, Fayetteville, Ark.: Training building	87,000
N&MCRTC, Freeport, N.Y.: Training center	35,000
NREF, Helena, Mont.: Training building	56,000
NREF, Medford, Oreg.: Training building	56,000
NREF, Paris, Tex.: Training building and acquisition of land	90,000
N&MCRTC, Phoenix, Ariz.: Training center	600,000
NREF, Provo, Utah: Training building	56,000
NREF, Red Bluff, Calif.: Training building	80,000
NREF, Redding, Calif.: Training building	80,000
N&MCRTC, Topeka, Kans.: Training center	383,000
NREF, Wenatchee, Wash.: Training building	65,000
NREF, Yuba City, Calif.: Training building	75,000
Total, surface facilities	2,327,000

MARINE CORPS RESERVE, GROUND

MCRTC, Johnstown, Pa.: Purchase of land and training center	$65,000
N&MCRTC, Phoenix, Ariz.: Training center	225,000
N&MCRTC, Topeka, Kans.: Training center	123,000
Total, ground facilities	413,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE PROGRAM	DATE 23 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AIR STATION	NEW YORK, KINGS COUNTY, NEW YORK	145196

4. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	5. COMMAND	6. OTHER JOINT USERS	7. YEAR OCCUPIED	8. UTILIZATION
BUWEPS	CNARESTRA	AIR NAT'L GUARD: USCG DET., NY AIR POLICE	1941	643 FLT HRS/WEEK

9. RADIUS	10. URBAN CENTERS SERVED	11. POPULATION	12. TRAVEL TIME - HOURS	13. OTHER RESERVE FACILITIES IN AREA
150MI	LONG ISLAND, SOUTHERN N.Y. STATE	14,234,000	PRIVATE 5 PUBLIC 0	NAVAL SURFACE RESERVE UNIT TRAINING CENTER

SECTION II. MISSION TO MAINTAIN AND OPERATE FACILITIES AND PROVIDE SERVICES AND MATERIAL TO SUPPORT OPERATIONS OF AVIATION ACTIVITIES AND UNITS OF THE NAVAL AND MARINE AIR RESERVE TRAINING COMMAND AND OTHER ACTIVITIES AND UNITS, AS DESIGNATED BY THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF	EM	CIV	JOINT USERS	TOTAL
RESERVES.	1. ON BOARD	835	1859	0	1113	3807
	2. AUTHORIZED	938	2735	0	1113	4786
	3. ULTIMATE	938	2735	0	641	4314
PERM. PARTY.	1. ON BOARD	53	694	137	323	1207
	2. AUTHORIZED	63	738	146	332	1279

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT 84	PLANNED 80	ULTIMATE	80
NO. OF AIRCRAFT OF OTHER JOINT USERS	PRESENT 28	PLANNED		41

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *(Present Facility)*

	LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTAL ($)
1. OWNED		1273	4,319,000	25,454,000	29,773,000
2. LEASED/EASEMENTS		-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 July 1959				(EXCEPT LAND RENT)	29,773,000
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY					1,622,000
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST					421,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION					3,963,000
7. GRAND TOTAL					35,829,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS *(In Thousands of $)*			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
112	EXTENSION OF TAXIWAY	SY	122361	14200	0	14200	331	0	331	331
149	AIRCRAFT ARRESTING GEAR	EA	0	2	0	2	140	0	140	140

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE INSTALLATION DATA			
DD FORM 1390 (12-58)	TOTAL *(Incl. Cont. sheet)*	471	471
	TOTAL OTHER JOINT USERS PORTION OF THIS PROJECT	0	0
	TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT	471	471

NAVAL AIR STATION, N.Y.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall consider now the Naval Air Station, New York.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How long do you propose to continue the use of the Naval Air Station, New York?

Commander SWOPE. Mr. Chairman, we expect to continue occupancy and use of this facility indefinitely. We have no plans for closing it out, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you encountering any difficulties with apartment construction interfering with your air operations here?

Commander SWOPE. No, sir; we are not encountering any difficulties.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question is directed to zoning limitations that might interfere with your taking off and setting down. You say you have no problem?

Commander SWOPE. None that we are aware of; no, sir.

NAVAL RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, FORT M'HENRY, MD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next, we shall pick up the Naval Reserve Training Center, Fort McHenry, Md.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE PROGRAM	DATE 23 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
NAVAL RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	FORT McHENRY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND	5595-058

4. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	5. COMMAND	6. OTHER JOINT USERS	7. YEAR OCCUPIED	8. UTILIZATION
BUREAU OF PERSONNEL	5TH NAVDIST	COAST GUARD	1947	5 NIGHTS/WEEK

9. RADIUS	10. URBAN CENTERS SERVED	11. POPULATION	12. TRAVEL TIME HOURS	13. OTHER RESERVE FACILITIES IN AREA
25 MILES	BALTIMORE AND LOCALE	950,000	PRIVATE 1 PUBLIC 2	MARINE, ARMY AIR RESERVE, NATIONAL GUARD

SECTION II. MISSION TO ESTABLISH, SUPPORT, AND MAINTAIN ESSENTIAL TRAINING FOR OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE NAVAL RESERVE TO PROVIDE TRAINED PERSONNEL TO MEET THE NAVY'S MOBILIZATION REQUIREMENTS

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF	EM	CIV	JOINT USERS	TOTAL
RESERVES	1. ON BOARD	168	1,121	-	237	1,526
	2. AUTHORIZED	174	1,656	-	270	2,100
	3. ULTIMATE	174	1,656	-	270	2,100
PERM. PARTY	1. ON BOARD	2	26	1	1	30
	2. AUTHORIZED	2	27	1	1	31

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -	
NO. OF AIRCRAFT OF OTHER JOINT USERS	PRESENT -	PLANNED -		

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *(Present Facility)*

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTAL ($)
1. OWNED	3	-	72,000	72,000*
2. LEASED/EASEMENTS	-	(-)	-	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (EXCEPT LAND RENT)				72,000*
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				95,000***
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				300,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				467,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS *(In Thousands of $)*			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
171	TRAINING CENTER REHABILITATION	SF	50,255 (SUBSTANDARD)	47,635**	0	47,635**	300	0	300	300
	*NAVY IMPROVEMENTS **REHABILITATION OF ONE BUILDING ONLY ***REHABILITATION OF EXISTING PIER									
						TOTAL (Incl. Cont. Amt)			300	300
						TOTAL OTHER JOINT USERS PORTION OF THIS PROJECT			0	0
						TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT			300	300

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2670 (12-59)

Mr. SHEPPARD. It looks as if every time we take a look at this the Navy wants to do something at Fort McHenry. Just what is the situation here?

Commander SWOPE. Mr. Chairman, this center, which we propose to rehabilitate, is the one presently in use. These buildings are quite old and will require extensive rehabilitation in order to make them usable for an extended period of time. This item for $300,000 would accomplish this rehabilitation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. Is that to be joint use?

Commander SWOPE. No, sir. This is a Navy use only, sir. We have immediately adjacent Navy ships which would be in there.

Mr. JONAS. I was looking at item 13 where you say: "Marine, Air, Army Air Reserve, and National Guard." You do not mean they will use the same center?

Commander SWOPE. No, sir. They are in the Baltimore area, but not at this particular center. We do have a small Coast Guard unit there.

Mr. JONAS. Do you know of any plan to build additional armories in the area?

Commander SWOPE. No, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I am thinking of the possibility of joint use.

Commander SWOPE. No, sir. We have investigated the possibility of joint use elsewhere, and there is nothing available at this time.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now we shall turn to the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center at Phoenix, Ariz.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE PROGRAM	DATE 23 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
NAVAL & MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	PHOENIX, ARIZONA	5595-700

4. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	5. COMMAND	6. OTHER JOINT USERS	7. YEAR OCCUPIED	8. UTILIZATION
BUREAU OF PERSONNEL	NAVDIST 11TH	COAST GUARD & MARINE CORPS RESERVE	1947	5 NIGHTS/WEEK - 2 WEEKENDS/MONTH

9. RADIUS	10. URBAN CENTERS SERVED	11. POPULATION	12. TRAVEL TIME HOURS	13. OTHER RESERVE FACILITIES IN AREA
60 MILES	PHOENIX, MESA, GLENDALE, COOLIDGE	500,000	PRIVATE 1.5 PUBLIC 3	ARIZ. NATIONAL GUARD, AIR FORCE, ARMY RESERVE

SECTION II. MISSION

TO PROVIDE EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES FOR TRAINING, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF UNITS OF THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE AND COMPONENTS OF OTHER SERVICES AS NECESSARY.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF	EM	CIV	JOINT USERS	TOTAL
RESERVES	1. ON BOARD	46	455	-	191	692
	2. AUTHORIZED	50	505	-	199	754
	3. ULTIMATE	100	900	-	212	1,212
PERM. PARTY	1. ON BOARD	3	21	-	9	33
	2. AUTHORIZED	3	21	-	9	33

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -
NO. OF AIRCRAFT OF OTHER JOINT USERS	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	

SECTION IV. INVENTORY (Present Facility)

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTAL ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED/EASEMENTS	1	($97/YR)	333,000	333,000 *
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959			(EXCEPT LAND RENT)	333,000 *
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				600,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				600,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION			PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
171	TRAINING CENTER	SF	32,240*	25,656	0	25,656	600	0	600	600
	* LOCATED ON LEASED LAND WHICH THE LESSOR HAS INDICATED NEED FOR AFTER JUNE 1962. INCLUDES MARINE CORPS RESERVE EXCLUSIVE SPACE. NOT INCLUDED IN TOTAL INVENTORY FOR THIS PROJECT.									
						TOTAL (Incl. Cont. sheet)			600	600
						TOTAL OTHER JOINT USERS PORTION OF THIS PROJECT			225	225
						TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT			825	825

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE INSTALLATION DATA

NAVDOCKS 2070 (12-58)

TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT		825	825

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE PROGRAM	DATE 23 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	PHOENIX, ARIZONA	5595-700

4. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	5. COMMAND	6. OTHER JOINT USERS	7. YEAR OCCUPIED	8. UTILIZATION
COMMARCORPS	12TH MCRRD	NAVAL RESERVE, COAST GUARD RESERVE	1947	FOUR DRILLS/MO

9. RADIUS	10. URBAN CENTERS SERVED	11. POPULATION	12. TRAVEL TIME - HOURS	13. OTHER RESERVE FACILITIES IN AREA
60 MILES	PHOENIX, MESA, COOLIDGE, GLENDALE	500,000	PRIVATE 1.5 PUBLIC 3	NATIONAL GUARD, AIR FORCE, ARMY RESERVE

SECTION II. MISSION

ESTABLISHING, SUPPORTING, AND/OR MAINTAINING THE ESSENTIAL TRAINING OF ONE OR MORE OF THE RESERVE FORCES TO MEET THE OVERALL MOBILIZATION MISSION

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF	EM	CIV	JOINT USERS	TOTAL
RESERVES	1. ON BOARD	8	183	-	501	692
	2. AUTHORIZED	8	191	-	555	754
	3. ULTIMATE	11	201	-	1,000	1,212
PERM. PARTY	1. ON BOARD	2	7	-	24	33
	2. AUTHORIZED	2	7	-	24	33

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT	-	PLANNED	-	ULTIMATE	-
NO. OF AIRCRAFT OF OTHER JOINT USERS			PRESENT	-	PLANNED	-

SECTION IV. INVENTORY (Present Facility)

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTAL ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED/EASEMENTS	1	($97/YR)	333,000	333,000**
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959			(EXCEPT LAND RENT)	333,000**
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				225,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				225,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION			PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
171	TRAINING CENTER	SF	5,530*	12,152	0	12,152	225	0	225	225

*EXCLUSIVE MARINE CORPS RESERVE SPACE, TOTAL FOR JOINT FACILITY IS 32,240 SQ. FT., ALL OF WHICH IS LOCATED ON LEASED LAND THAT LESSOR HAS INDICATED A NEED FOR AFTER JUNE 1962.

**NOT INCLUDED IN GRAND TOTAL SINCE SITE TO BE RELEASED TO LESSOR.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE INSTALLATION DATA DAYDOCKS 2670 (12-58)			
	TOTAL (Incl. Cont. sheet)	225	225
	TOTAL OTHER JOINT USERS PORTION OF THIS PROJECT	600	600
	TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT	825	825

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present training center situation at Phoenix?

Commander SWOPE. The present center, Mr. Chairman, is utilized on lease from the school board. The school requires this space for its own expansion purposes. They will not renew the lease we have with them. We are proposing to build this training center, which will be jointly utilized by the Navy and the Marine Corps, and it will also provide space for possible use by the National Guard at a future date.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why do you need an $825,000 building for this requirement? What makes that expenditure necessary to that amount?

Commander SWOPE. The second item, is that it, Mr. Chairman, the Marine portion?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Commander SWOPE. It is customary that we provide two items in the program where we have a Marine Corps need. This item will accomplish the building necessary for the use of the Marine Corps itself. The other item which is listed under Navy, in the amount of $600,000, will provide the Navy space and the joint-use space.

NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, TOPEKA, KANS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Next we come to the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Topeka, Kans.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE PROGRAM	AS OF 23 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO
NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	TOPEKA, KANSAS	5595-914

4. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	5. COMMAND	6. OTHER JOINT USERS	7. YEAR OCCUPIED	8. UTILIZATION
BUREAU OF PERSONNEL	9TH NAVDIST	MARINE CORPS RESERVE	1946	2 NIGHTS/WEEK

9. RADIUS	10. URBAN CENTERS SERVED	11. POPULATION	12. TRAVEL TIME HOURS	13. OTHER RESERVE FACILITIES IN AREA
30 MILES	TOPEKA, LAWRENCE, WALEGO, ROSEVILLE	132,000	PRIVATE 1.0 PUBLIC 1.25	ARMY RESERVE

SECTION II. MISSION

TO PROVIDE TRAINING FOR OFFICERS AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL	OFF	EM	CIV	JOINT USERS	TOTAL
RESERVES. 1. ON BOARD	13	130	-	5-95	243
2. AUTHORIZED	12	200	-	5-95	312
3. ULTIMATE	12	250	-	6-153	421
PERM. PARTY. 1. ON BOARD	1	8	-	1-6	16
2. AUTHORIZED	1	8	-	1-6	16

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -
NO. OF AIRCRAFT OF OTHER JOINT USERS	PRESENT	PLANNED	

SECTION IV. INVENTORY *(Present Facility)*

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTAL ($)
1. OWNED	-	-	-	0
2. LEASED/EASEMENTS	-	($12,000/YR)	0	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959		(EXCEPT LAND RENT)		0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				383,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				383,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION		PHYSICAL CAPACITY					AMOUNTS *(In Thousands of $)*			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
171	TRAINING CENTER	SF	25,680* (SUBSTANDARD)	18,733	0	18,733	383	0	383	383
	*LEASED SPACE TO BE RELEASED TO OWNER									
						TOTAL *(Incl. Cont. sheet)*			383	383
						TOTAL OTHER JOINT USERS PORTION OF THIS PROJECT			123	123
						TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT			506	506

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE INSTALLATION DATA
NAVDOCKS 2570 (12-58)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY	FY 1961 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE PROGRAM	DATE 23 FEBRUARY 1960

SECTION I. INSTALLATION DATA

1. NAME	2. LOCATION	3. INSTALLATION CONTROL NO.
NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	TOPEKA, KANSAS	5595-914

4. MANAGEMENT BUREAU OR OFFICE	5. COMMAND	6. OTHER JOINT USERS	7. YEAR OCCUPIED	8. UTILIZATION
COMMARCORPS	9TH MCRRD	NAVAL RESERVE	1946	FOUR DRILLS/MO

9. RADIUS	10. URBAN CENTERS SERVED	11. POPULATION	12. TRAVEL TIME - HOURS	13. OTHER RESERVE FACILITIES IN AREA
30 MILES	TOPEKA, LAWRENCE, WAKEGO, ROSEVILLE	132,000	PRIVATE 1 PUBLIC 1.25	ARMY RESERVE

SECTION II. MISSION: ESTABLISHING, SUPPORTING, AND/OR MAINTAINING THE ESSENTIAL TRAINING OF ONE OR MORE OF THE RESERVE FORCES TO MEET THE OVERALL MOBILIZATION MISSION.

SECTION III. PERSONNEL AND AIRCRAFT LOADING

PERSONNEL		OFF	EM	CIV	JOINT USERS	TOTAL
RESERVES	1. ON BOARD	5	95	-	13-130	243
	2. AUTHORIZED	5	95	-	12-200	312
	3. ULTIMATE	6	153	-	17-199	375
PERM. PARTY	1. ON BOARD	1	6	-	1-8	16
	2. AUTHORIZED	1	6	-	1-8	16

NO. OF AIRCRAFT	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	ULTIMATE -
NO. OF AIRCRAFT OF OTHER JOINT USERS	PRESENT -	PLANNED -	

SECTION IV. INVENTORY (Present Facility)

LAND	ACRES	LAND COST ($)	IMPROVEMENTS ($)	TOTAL ($)
1. OWNED	-	-		0
2. LEASE/EASEMENTS	0	(12,000/YR)	0	0
3. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF 1 JULY 1959 (EXCEPT LAND RENT)				0
4. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
5. AUTHORIZATION IN THIS REQUEST				123,000
6. ESTIMATED FUTURE AUTHORIZATION				0
7. GRAND TOTAL				123,000

SECTION V. INSTALLATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

CODE AND DESCRIPTION			PHYSICAL CAPACITY				AMOUNTS (In Thousands of $)			
NAVY CODE	LINE ITEM TITLE	UNIT	INVENTORY AS OF 1 JULY 1959	ADDITIONAL CAPACITY REQUIRED	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	ESTIMATED COST OF REQUIRED FACILITIES	PRIOR AUTHORIZATION OUTSTANDING 1 JULY 1959	NEW AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED	NEW APPROPRIATION REQUESTED
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
171	TRAINING CENTER	SF	9,619* (SUBSTANDARD)	7,630	0	7,630	123	0	123	123
	*LEASED SPACE WILL REVERT TO LESSOR									

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NAVAL RESERVE INSTALLATION DATA			
	TOTAL (Incl. Cont. sheet)	123	123
	TOTAL OTHER JOINT USERS PORTION OF THIS PROJECT	383	383
	TOTAL COST TO GOVERNMENT	506	506

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Naval Reserve at Topeka appears to be understrength. Why should we build a half million dollar facility where there is such an apparent lack of interest?

Commander SWOPE. Mr. Chairman, we have occupied on lease part of the Masonic Lodge Building, utilizing only the basement of that building. The facilities are very inadequate and are not conducive to Reserve training at all. This is true both in the case of the Navy and the Marine Corps Reserve.

This project proposes to build onto the Army Reserve Center which is already in existence, and to provide the necessary facilities for the Marine Corps and the Navy at that site. At present the Marine Corps does not have any outside drill space. They do not have a rifle range. We cannot conduct proper training.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand you check the program in geographical areas in order to justify the need for construction in this field. What is the total population in this area?

Commander SWOPE. The total population in the immediate area of Topeka, within a circle of about 30 miles, is around 150,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You would take in Topeka. Outside of the circumference of Topeka, what suburbs do you take in?

Commander SWOPE. It would include Lawrence, Kans., which is about 30 miles away, I believe, and Wamego, which is a smaller city. Those are the main population centers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Generally speaking, in your survey what is the extent from dead center in the peripheral concept that you use to evaluate the requirements for X dollars for X building?

Commander SWOPE. We normally consider 50 miles as a workable radius from that point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would that be the law of averages?

Commander SWOPE. That would be normal; yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. You have but 1 unit there, 13 officers and 130 men, and plan to use this armory but 2 nights a week; is that right?

Commander SWOPE. Yes, sir. We have, of course, the marine unit in addition to that. This is a Navy unit, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You mean in addition to the 2 nights a week? You use it 1 night and the marines 1 night; is that not true?

Commander SWOPE. Yes, sir; that is correct. But the additional 100 people that the marines have are not indicated in the figure you stated, sir.

Mr. JONAS. It is a pretty expensive operation for just 1 night a week.

Commander SWOPE. This, of course, is on the basis of the pay units only, as indicated here.

Mr. JONAS. What other use do you make of it?

Commander SWOPE. We have in addition to this, nonpay units, officers' schools, and various other programs which are not reflected in these numbers or in this utilization. The justifications that we do submit are based on the pay units only, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Is any land acquisition involved?

Commander SWOPE. No, sir. The Army Reserve is providing us with the land. We will be immediately adjacent to their present training center building.

Mr. JONAS. Why do you not build a small addition to the Army Reserve Armory, since you use it only 2 nights a week, and save constructing a new building?

Commander SWOPE. This is actually to provide only part of the total normal space required for these units, and we shall utilize the Army space which they can make available to us.

Mr. JONAS. 18,000 square feet is a pretty good sized armory, is it not?

Commander SWOPE. That is a pretty good sized armory; however, most of our armories will average in the neighborhood of 30,000 square feet, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Will this building be adjacent to the Army Reserve unit?

Commander SWOPE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Not connected to it, though?

Commander SWOPE. It will be connected to it; yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. How frequently is the Army armory used? How many nights a week?

Commander SWOPE. I would have to provide that for the record for you, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Have you explored the possibility of getting joint use of the Army armory?

Commander SWOPE. Yes, sir, and we will use some of their facilities jointly with them.

Mr. JONAS. Why is this not sufficient for all your requirements, since you have a very small operation here?

Commander SWOPE. Not all of our requirements are compatible with theirs in the nature of the training that we give and which the Army provides. In other words, there are certain types of class training and such as that which we enter into and which they do not.

Mr. JONAS. You use the same classrooms, though, do you not?

Commander SWOPE. Not entirely, sir, because we do have training equipment of a type that the Army does not use.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has been my general understanding, perhaps erroneously, that many of these armories have to operate per night in a different concept in different locations because of the type of people they have to deal with in their program. Is that a factor or is it not? That has been my conception.

Commander SWOPE. We have different types of units which do affect the scheduling very directly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Adaptable to each one of your locations as far as the meeting nights are concerned?

Commander SWOPE. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no broad law covering the actual requirements of Monday, Tuesday, or any other night of the week. It must relate to the requirement.

Commander SWOPE. Yes, sir; at that particular location.

(Off the record.)

Mr. JONAS. With your permission, I shall ask that a statement be put in the record to show why you cannot use the armory that is already in existence for your requirements at this base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Please provide that.

Commander SWOPE. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, TOPEKA, KANS.

The present facilities for the training of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve units in Topeka are located in leased space in the basement of the Masonic Temple. This provides only two-thirds of the space required for these units. This, coupled with a very small drill-assembly area and a complete lack of a rifle range, plus disorderly and inefficient layout of the space available, precludes effective and maximum training of the reservists assigned. By virtue of its unsatisfactory condition and inherent unattractiveness, the present facility has a depressant effect upon the recruiting and manning of the Reserve units there.

No suitable space is available for lease in the Topeka area. This item, therefore, proposes to construct a minimum addition to the existing Army Reserve training center, as required to support the needs of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve.

The 400-man Army Reserve training center is utilized by nine Army Reserve units, with presently assigned strength of 538, three and four nights each week and two weekends per month. Three Naval Reserve units will utilize these facilities two nights per week and the Marine Corps Reserve one weekend per month.

By utilizing the existing classrooms to the maximum extent practicable plus the rifle range, ammunition and range storage, heating plant, utilities, and parking area, the construction requirements of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve are accordingly reduced from 37,850 square feet to 26,363 square feet. However, the Army Reserve training center cannot provide the administrative, general storage, vehicular garage, weapons stowage and repair, radar-CIC classrooms, electrician workshop, general maintenance and utility shop, radio transmitter and receiver room, and technical library spaces required for sole use by the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve. The proposed project will meet this need.

Experience has shown that activities which can offer effective training programs will attract personnel to those programs. This project will provide the essential facilities now lacking. The growth potential of the Topeka area is considered excellent as evidenced by the overflow strength of the Army Reserve.

By adding to the Army Reserve training center a savings of approximately $215,000 is realized as compared to the cost of providing a unilateral facility.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your appearance.

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1960.

BALLISTIC MISSILES

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. R. J. FRIEDMAN, DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET, COMPTROLLER OF THE AIR FORCE
MAJ. GEN. B. K. HOLLOWAY, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF OPERATIONS
MAJ. GEN. H. T. WHELESS, DIRECTOR OF PLANS, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PLANS AND PROGRAMS
COL. W. E. LEONHARD, DEPUTY COMMANDER, FACILITIES, AIR FORCE BALLISTIC MISSILE DIVISION, AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
COL. G. A. KENT, CHIEF WEAPONS PLANS DIVISION, DIRECTORATE OF PLANS, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PLANS AND PROGRAMS
COL. T. H. RUNYON, CHIEF, BALLISTIC MISSILE DIVISION, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR GUIDED MISSILES

54569—60—pt. 2——38

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are taking up our ballistic missile requirements as set forth in this year's funding requirements. Colonel Leonhard, I presume you have a general statement you wish to present to the committee.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Colonel LEONHARD. I have no prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. I do have a set of charts here which I would like to run through.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may proceed.

Colonel LEONHARD. (Chart.) Just by way of background, Mr. Chairman, this was our 1959 program that I brought in about 2 years ago to this committee. At that time, with this color scheme I had indicated in red the scheduled placement of construction contracts in support of this program. This covered for ATLAS and TITAN at the bases indicated here. When I was back last year with this committee, I showed in blue our actual performance against the red schedule. As indicated, we got started a little later here than we had expected, but in all cases we finished placement of work earlier than we had thought possible. As a matter of fact, by the close of that fiscal year, fiscal 1959, we had all of our major contracts placed in the 1959 and prior years' budgets.

(Chart) Last year when I was before this committee I showed for ATLAS and TITAN in red the planned placement of contracts for the ATLAS squadrons through No. 9—squadrons 7, 8, and 9, at Warren 3, Schilling, and Lincoln. We had 4 TITANS in the program at Ellsworth, Larson, Mountain Home, and Beale.

As this committee now knows, the ATLAS program was reoriented. Four squadrons were added. These are at Altus, Dyess, Walker, and Plattsburgh. These we have projected in contract placements as indicated in blue. Actually the construction contracts for Schilling were awarded the first week in March, and work is now well underway. Contracts were placed 2 weeks ago for Lincoln, and this work is now underway. I have shown here contract placement for Altus, which is in Oklahoma, in May, although I think it probably will be moved forward to about the last week in April. Bids are scheduled to be taken on the 26th of this month. Similarly, Dyess, which is at Abilene, Tex. Although scheduled in June, this probably also will be placed and work started in the last week of May. That leaves us, then, Walker and Plattsburg, which we expect to get started on the 10th and 20th of June, respectively.

In TITAN, although we got started a little later because we had some change in our planning on this, all four of these squadrons were placed at 1-month intervals as indicated here, and all this work is now well along.

(Chart) Coming now to our 1961 budget request, I have shown here squadrons 7 through 13 of the ATLAS program. In this chart the black arrows to the right extreme represent the scheduled squadron operational dates for each of these units, and in blue extending to the left, the period for the associate contractors to install the ground support equipment and check out the total weapons system. In red is our period of construction; in brown is our period of design. The black arrow to the left of the red lines represent the dates on which contracts are placed for construction.

In fiscal year 1960, the current fiscal year, we placed contracts for all the work as indicated here. The 7th squadron, which is the third one at Cheyenne, is in the coffin configuration, horizontal and rotates to the vertical for firing. Then the 6th operational squadron, which is preceded by this prototype facility that we came to this committee and got clearance on early last fall at Vandenberg, and the training facility also at Vandenberg. All of this work, as I indicated in the previous chart, will be placed under contract in this fiscal year.

(Chart) Dollarwise, in 1961 we have just about bought out the currently approved ATLAS program in 1960. So we have in 1961 only the final round-out items to make this possible. We have a half million dollars at Patrick for modification of stands for the last series in the ATLAS program. Training facilities at Vandenberg, also for stand modification at that base. And $8.4 million for squadrons 11 through 13 for the missile assembly building, the LOX generator plants, the maintenance and storage and technical supplies. For a total for ATLAS in fiscal year 1961 of $9.4 million.

(Chart) Moving to TITAN, where we have a continuing program, shown at the top here are the four squadrons which are in our current fiscal year, fiscal year 1960—Ellsworth, Beale, Larson, and Mountain Home. All this work is currently proceeding.

The present budget request contains funds for these four squadrons plus the training base at Vandenberg, squadrons 7 through 10. An announcement has recently been made that two of these will be at Davis-Monthan, Ariz., and two at McConnell, Kans. Our design work is proceeding with this particular program, and we plan to place contracts in November and December of this year for these four squadrons. The 1962 request will pick up the balance of the TITAN program, although I would like to call attention to the condition which exists here with the experience we are currently having in the installation and checkout phase of bringing these squadrons into activation. More time may be required to the left of the activation dates here for this particular task which would further compress the construction period and may make it desirable for the Air Force to recommend later on some program adjustment that would permit the earlier start of these two squadrons, 11 and 12.

(Chart) This is a view of the TITAN II configuration, facility-wise, beginning with squadron 7. Our plan here is that the missile will be contained in a shock-isolated environment. This is shown in profile, and here in plan, distinguished from the manner in which the ATLAS and TITAN programs currently are operated, in which the missile is maintained in a hardened silo condition, but then prior to fire it is raised on an elevator to the surface prior to launch. In this case, for TITAN we propose to fire directly out of the hole. The missile will contain both the fuel and the oxidizer aboard, so immediately upon the command to fire and the rolling back of the hardened door at the top, the missile can be launched.

There were three unique problems associated with this particular concept, and these have been proven out by scale-model testing. We are satisfied that there are no problems that threaten the technical feasibility of this approach. The three problems that were faced were:

First, the acoustical loading on the missile frame. This has been demonstrated as being solvable by the placement on the interior of the launch chamber of acoustical lining that will absorb these sound effects.

The second problem dealt with thermodynamic and aerodynamic handling problems. By properly dimensioning the exhaust tubes in relation to the volume of hot gases involved, this is now feasible.

The third problem dealt with the dispersion of the missile on liftoff. It is resting on a seat at the bottom, and as the missile emerges slowly from the mouth of the tube against severe wind loadings it might drift toward the sides of the chamber. By a number of tests conducted up into winds a ratio of diameter of 2.7 has been determined. So the TITAN missile, being 10 feet in diameter, calls then for the diameter of the launch chamber to be 27 feet. Under these conditions there is no problem existing under this factor that I have mentioned.

In the concept here, the missile here is in the center. In these two hemispheres, the equipment is placed at various levels constantly to check out and launch the missile. These two ports here, which are shown on the side, are where the hot gases are exhausted from this B-frame at the bottom.

Personnel are located in a small capsule about 150 feet from the launchers as indicated here. The personnel entrance and equipment entrance is through this portal.

(Chart) Dollarwise, the TITAN, fiscal year 1961, totals $206.4 million. We have here the modification of stands and some expansion of the down-range facilities to accommodate the all-inertial system which will be incorporated in TITAN II, estimated at $1 million. Our training facilities at Vandenberg for TITAN will provide four launch positions. I might mention here that although these are all now tabbed for TITAN, the possibility exists that one of these will be converted to ATLAS. The price of these is $19 million. Our operational squadrons 7 through 10, $169.2 million, buys out all the technical facilities required in the launch positions. Our onbase technical facilities correspond to those I mentioned earlier for ATLAS. Missile assembly buildings for four squadrons here, the reentry vehicle, technical supplies, and so forth, $8.8 million. Advanced site preparation contemplates about $200,000 per site for squadrons 11 through 14. Since there are nine sites per squadron and four squadrons, the price on this would be $7.2 million and $1.2 million for land acquisition. This covers land to be purchased in fee and the safety easements surrounding the sites selected.

(Chart) Moving now to MINUTEMAN, you may recall that in our present fiscal year, fiscal year 1960, there is practically no MINUTEMAN program; only about $1 million or $2 million. This rounded off the test facilities required at Edwards Air Force Base in California and Cape Canaveral.

In 1961, we begin the operational deployment for MINUTEMAN, and our 1961 program contemplates the construction start on ——— squadrons. These are ——— squadrons and ——— launch control centers. I shall have a picture to show later. The balance shown here represents what is in the 1962 budget.

This [chart] is an artist's sketch of the hardened, dispersed MINUTEMAN concept. These are on a unitary program, dispersed

——— separation, MINUTEMAN here to be hardened as well as ———. We think it is entirely feasible and economical within the budget amounts shown here to move into the ——— region.

A capsule for launch control goes with each ——— of the missile silos that I have mentioned. There are ——— of these launch control centers in a squadron of ——— missiles. This is a view about the size of the placement involved. The crew is ——— personnel, and would be buried in the ground. It would be shock isolated to protect the equipment and the personnel at these levels.

Dollarwise, I have shown this in three columns because I believe the committee has been apprised of a $20 million reprogram exercise connected with MINUTEMAN in 1961. Our operational facilities totaling ——— operational missiles, $58.5 million. The integrated weapons system training is where the SAC crews who will be manning these positions will conduct their training exercises, including launchings to the Pacific range at Vandenberg. This will permit also the later rotation of operational missiles as they reach their anticipated life expectancy. Instead of simply discarding them, they can be brought to Vandenberg, and we can acquire experience with regard to deterioration in the effective life of these solid-propelled missiles.

Land acquisition: Here I would like to point out the fact that in the ——— squadrons contemplated for 1961, this is ——— separately dispersed launch sites plus ——— launch control centers. So this is ——— parcels of land which will need to be acquired in support of this program. The dollar value is not exceptional, but it does introduce many administrative problems of land acquisition.

Our on-base technical facilities are what we call the strategic missile support area, to which missiles on a rotational basis will be brought back for organizational level maintenance by the SAC squadrons, and individual black boxes that are found to require repair, such as guidance packages and ground support equipment packages, can be brought for repair.

Advance work in connection with the major program that will be undertaken in fiscal 1962:

I should like to report now on our plans for placement of this work on contract. For TITAN, under our current four-squadron plan for 1961, design status and land acquisition status are such that we would place under contract two squadrons in November and two squadrons in December of this year. Our MINUTEMAN program, the same factors considered, would permit us to put these under contract in the Malmstrom, Mont., area in the month of October.

In addition to ballistic missiles, in the program we are discussing this morning our military space systems, those systems assigned to the Air Force. Among those having a facility implication are SAMOS and MIDAS. We have other military space systems, but there are no facility requirements associated with them in this year.

We have $6.1 million for SAMOS. This will buy a model 3 guidance station at Vandenberg as well as fuel storage and loading facilities for the exotic fuels which are used in the second and third stages of these orbital vehicles. The tracking data acquisition building for SAMOS, we have designs completed 100 percent on the shelf at two locations: Fort Stevens, Oreg., and Ottumwa, Iowa. This one will be at Ottumwa.

For MIDAS, $11 million. This will provide a MIDAS acquisition station in ———. We are looking at the moment at various potential sites. The one most promising from a support standpoint, of course, is ———, but at the moment there are electronic interference problems there which need to be overcome technically. Work is proceeding on this basis. This readout station designwise will not be too difficult because we have already designed and have under construction in Alaska an identical unit, and we need then simply to adapt it to the ——— location.

In summary, all of the earlier sheets tabulated show: ATLAS, $9.4 million. TITAN as shown. MINUTEMAN, which includes the $21 million reprogram add-on. I have not covered base support. SAMOS and MIDAS as shown here. The $13 million for base support is in the program to provide communications expansion and other maintenance and supply expansion as necessary, dependent upon the specific sites established for the ICBM force. Now that these are established as Malmstrom, Davis-Monthan, and McConnell, which has only recently been announced, this particular package can be further definitized.

I have nothing else of a formal presentation nature. I would be very happy to answer questions.

STATUS OF FUNDS

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are requesting $297,600,000 plus the $20 million reprograming. What is the status of funds for the ballistic missile program, including funds authorized, appropriated, delegated, and expended? I want all categories covered in your response.

Colonel LEONHARD. I am not a good spokesman on that particular subject, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let anyone here answer the questions I am presenting. We expect to have the answers, gentlemen. If they are not here, why aren't they?

General MINTON. I can get the answer to that, but the detail that you ask for there, Mr. Sheppard, we would have to present it to this committee later.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then supply it for the record.

(The information requested follows:)

The following data presents the status of funds appropriated for the ballistic missile and space program through fiscal year 1960 under the appropriation "Military construction." The obligation and expenditure amounts are as of March 31, 1960:

Authorized	[1] $1,067,391,000
Appropriated	1,067,391,000
Obligations	793,763,000
Expenditures	407,863,000

[1] Includes $1,023,614,000 for construction and $43,777,000 for planning.

Colonel LEONHARD. I would like to comment in that regard, Mr. Chairman, again referring to the charts that I have used, that we expect by the close of this fiscal year to have placed every contract for which we have authorization to proceed in this fiscal year. There will be no carryover of projects into the next year that have been authorized and appropriated for this year.

DETERRENT FORCE REQUIRED BY UNITED STATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Based on the national intelligence estimates regarding Soviet missile capabilities, what counterforce is required by the United States, if you know, at this time? Has that been discussed and an arrangement and principle of procedure evolved here? Have you a witness present who can answer that question?

Colonel LEONHARD. May I speak off the record just a minute?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

(Off the record.)

Colonel LEONHARD. I think, Mr. Chairman, the committee is entitled to an Air Force position on this. May I suggest that this be obtained from Air Force headquarters. There should be someone from the operations planning staff who could give a better answer on this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have the proper witnesses here to discuss this matter at 2 this afternoon. Meanwhile, we will discuss the individual programs.

(Testimony referred to will be found beginning on p. 624.)

ATLAS MISSILE PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall take up the ATLAS program. What has been your experience to date on actual versus estimated costs for this program?

Colonel LEONHARD. Mr. Chairman, as you know, in ATLAS we have gone through five configurations, beginning with concentrated squadrons, and soft, to fully dispersed squadrons on a unitary basis, and hard. In all cases our ultimate cost on the ATLAS program for each squadron has been within the amount that we have programed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean within the amount of your estimates?

Colonel LEONHARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the need for additional facilities for the ATLAS missile?

Colonel LEONHARD. In the 1961 program, Mr. Chairman, for the record, I could refer back to the presentation I have just given and, if you wish, I would be glad to repeat that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; do so.

Colonel LEONHARD. As I recall, we have a half million dollars at Patrick for modification and extension of test facilities to take care of the last package or the last series of flight testing. This will be for the "E" series ATLAS missile. We have a half million dollars at Vandenberg to make similar modifications for the training stands at that base. Then we have $8.4 million—again I am pulling this out of my head—$8.4 million for the provision of relatively short lead-time items for Squadrons 11, 12, and 13 in the ATLAS program. This provides a missile assembly building for each squadron; a LOX generating plant for each squadron; a reentry building, nose cone; a receiving, maintenance, and inspection building; and a technical supply for the storage of spares.

The total for ATLAS in fiscal year 1961 is $9.4 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is this the complete technical support for the 11th, 12th, and 13th squadrons at the present moment?

Colonel LEONHARD. Yes, sir. For our currently approved ATLAS program, this is the end of the line.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under present deployment plans, will this complete the funding of the ATLAS program in its entirety?

Colonel LEONHARD. It does, facilitywise; it does.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That covers the overall. The question had to do with the overall operation. Is your answer still the same?

Colonel LEONHARD. I am covering what we call P–300 appropriation. There are other procurement appropriations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, but they are in the bill——

Colonel LEONHARD. They are in another bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as this request is concerned, in the joint presentation, this covers the total, here and elsewhere?

Colonel LEONHARD. Yes, sir.

TITAN MISSILE PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your cost experience on the TITAN construction?

Colonel LEONHARD. I would make the same comment. Our bid experience at the six squadrons where we have work underway indicates that we are within the amounts which were presented to the committee last year and as we had originally planned, within those amounts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What are the proposed locations for the remaining TITAN squadrons you have referred to?

Colonel LEONHARD. There are four squadrons, Mr. Chairman. This will be Squadrons 7 through 10 in the 1961 budget request. Two of these are to be located at Davis-Monthan, Ariz., and two at McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the nature of the additional land required?

Colonel LEONHARD. Our land requirements have been on a gradually reducing scale as we have eliminated the ground guidance stations, which involved very substantial land taking. Our land requirement now for each position is on the order of 10 to 12 acres for the squadrons which are in the 1961 budget request, which will have all-inertial guidance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the land under option or do you have it available otherwise?

Colonel LEONHARD. We acquire land in fee for the actual site of construction. Then we have a safety easement which is acquired at a radius of 2,500 feet from the launcher. This is acquired simply as an easement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That safety feature applies across the board, does it not?

Colonel LEONHARD. Across the board to all of them: yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does this represent the full funding for the 7th through 10th Squadrons?

Colonel LEONHARD. It represents full funding with the exception of the short lead items on Squadron 10. This buys the short lead items on Spadrons 7, 8, and 9, but not on Squadron 10.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What squadrons are included in the technical support request?

Colonel LEONHARD. That would be Squadrons 7 through 10.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the status of plans and specifications, gentlemen, having to do with the program which I have inquired about up to now?

Colonel LEONHARD. Our designs for the ATLAS program, which represents these short lead items and totals $9.4 million, are substantially complete. We expect to place those under contract as soon as funds for fiscal year 1961 are available. Our designs on the four Squadrons of TITAN have been underway for several months, and I would say that at this moment they are approximately 30 percent finished. We expect to have our designs fully completed by the 1st of September. This will permit them to be reproduced, advertised, evaluated, and awards made in November, with a 6-week advertising period.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, your experience in this field of construction requirements has been definitized to the degree that you now know what you want and you can enter into competitive contracts instead of the so-called negotiated contracts. Is that correct or incorrect?

Colonel LEONHARD. That is exactly correct. I would like to make a comment on it, however.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

Colonel LEONHARD. There comes along every now and then a prototype facility required for a new configuration, where in our collective judgment with our construction agency it would be prudent to accomplish this work by a B-type contract, such as the two prototypes we have going now at Vandenberg, with which you are familiar. When those occasions do arise, arrangements are well understood that the Air Force will be over and talk with you about it.

With respect to a selected bidders list, we have not generally done this. It was done in 1957 for one project, our first operational project at Vandenberg, and we have under consideration at this time perhaps restricting the bidding to a dozen or so qualified firms for another urgent project at Vandenberg which we can then handle on a competitive basis rather than on a fee basis.

But generally speaking, all of our projects are on the open market.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any questions on my right having to do with the two missiles, ATLAS and TITAN? We have others to go into with general questions. Have you any questions on those two missiles?

Mr. SIKES. No questions at this time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite understand that limitation on the bidding on the Vandenberg contract.

Colonel LEONHARD. In our first contract, what we call 65–1, which is the hybrid between an R. & D. facility and the later-on operational configurations that we come to, these are the three stands that have a gantry on them and the only three stands that we have in our total program with gantries. In 1957, when this work was undertaken, we knew there were a number of unknowns remaining in our plans at that time, and on the basis of these conditions the Los Angeles district engineer restricted bidding to six or eight firms in order to assure that he got a competent, qualified, experienced outfit on the job.

Is that responsive to your question?

Mr. LAIRD. I thought you were referring to a future bid that you were going to limit the bidding on.

Colonel LEONHARD. We have another condition similar to this. This has to do with a training facility at Vandenberg in support of the last six squadrons of ATLAS, where we are getting started just now with it. We need to have the facilities substantially completed by March of 1961, and this is a very short time period. Here we would be dead if we got a marginal or submarginal contractor on the job. We have under consideration at this time the desirability of restricting bidding to a preselected list of competent firms on this particular project.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we are going to get into a discussion later on, are we, on the duplication of the last TITAN missle and MINUTEMAN?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. That is all I have.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to ask the colonel one question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well, Mr. Jonas.

Mr. JONAS. How far along are you with the underground facility at Vandenberg, started last fall?

Colonel LEONHARD. I think perhaps the time that you were up there, you looked at what we call the OSTF for TITAN. So far as we are concerned, we are finished completely with this. Black boxes and other types of equipment are now being installed by Martin and AMF and their associate contractors. We expect to conduct the first launch from that underground position——

Mr. JONAS. The construction phase is practically completed?

Colonel LEONHARD. The construction phase is completed on that, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

MINUTEMAN MISSILE PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to discuss the MINUTEMAN with you and ask you what is the status of the plans and specifications for the MINUTEMAN program.

Colonel LEONHARD. The MINUTEMAN is well advanced designwise. We have selected ——— sites for the launchers and launch control centers. Our designs are between one-third and one-half completed. We expect to have designs fully complete on this in July in order to have a contract placement and the start of work in October.

Mr. SIKES. Are plans for mobility of MINUTEMAN being developed at this time?

Colonel LEONHARD. For MINUTEMAN there is; yes, sir. We propose that a portion of the total MINUTEMAN force will be deployed in mobile status.

Mr. SIKES. Is that mobility planning requested in this budget?

Colonel LEONHARD. There are no facility implications in the mobile MINUTEMAN at this time.

Mr. SIKES. Will there be in later budgets?

Colonel LEONHARD. To a very small degree, Mr. Sikes. We may have, for example, one or two small ones—the provision of a railroad spur at Vandenberg in order to run in a train there and launch to the west as a practice launch. Generally our plan with the Association of American Railroads is to utilize existing sidings for holding temporarily these MINUTEMAN trains. It is possible that there would

be conditions where there is no convenient rail spur, and this would have to be provided for, but this has not been identified in this year's budget. We do not visualize this to any great extent.

Mr. SIKES. One major point in favor of the MINUTEMAN is the fact that it is capable of development as a mobile system, and we are very much interested in being assured that that possibility is not overlooked. So you are telling me the fact that there is nothing in this budget that reflects mobility does not indicate any lack of emphasis or interest in developing it?

Colonel LEONHARD. Certainly not. We are well aware, within the Air Force, of the strong desire and motivation to get mobile MINUTEMAN just as soon as possible. The mobile force is being stressed and pushed equally hard with the unitary deployment. We have a schedule for bringing this force into the inventory.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONAS. Will you yield right there?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. It would be possible to adapt a regular railroad boxcar to the use of the missile, would it not? Is that your plan?

Colonel LEONHARD. A train will have ——— cars, and most of them can be standard cars. There will be a car for personnel.

Mr. JONAS. We have plenty of those.

Colonel LEONHARD. There are two cars that would have to be unique. One is the car to mount the misssile on, because when it stands erect, then you must have some way of getting rid of the flame. The other car which would be unique would be the launch control center. But the car to handle the electric power, the spare parts, the personnel, the feeding, and so forth, would be standard.

Mr. JONAS. How long would it take to acquire these special cars?

Colonel LEONHARD. These are under development. There are a few under procurement in the 1961 budget in what we call the P–200 area.

Mr. JONAS. The only construction, therefore, that would be involved would be the building of some sidetracks?

Colonel LEONHARD. If this is necessary.

WARHEAD STORAGE

Mr. SHEPPARD. The dispersal of the MINUTEMAN silos and your plan to fire the missile seem to me to add to your problem for warhead storage. Just what do you plan in this respect and to what extent have these plans been approved by the AEC?

Colonel LEONHARD. First of all, I want to be sure I understand the problem that you visualize. I am not real sure that I do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are preparing for those eventualities insofar as the storage of your warheads are concerned?

Colonel LEONHARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has AEC approved of this plan of operation, if you know?

Colonel LEONHARD. I cannot comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

Colonel RUNYON. On the latter part of the question, AEC has not approved this plan of operation. We are currently discussing this and studying it with them now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, they have not approved it yet but it is currently under discussion?

Colonel RUNYON. That is correct.

NEED FOR OPERATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEST AND TRAINING SILOS

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are requesting funds for operational development test silos and training silos. Can you, or can you not conduct the necessary tests by use of the training silos exclusively instead of duplication? There must be reason for it. What is the reason for the duplication?

Colonel LEONHARD. We recognize this problem and a very serious effort is going to be made to do just this: To combine the operational development phase of the job and have that incorporated as part of the first operational squadron. The first —— launch sites for example, of the first ——— missile squadrons might well be used for this. This is under active consideration at this moment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How firm do you consider your request may be for the ——— training silos?

Colonel LEONHARD. ——— training silos we think are firm. This will be the only silos in the country from which we can conduct actual launchings.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What was the basis on which you established that number?

Colonel LEONHARD. It does several things, Mr. Chairman: One, our standard package is that one launch control center controls ——— positions, so that from the standpoint of standardization of ground equipment, operating equipment, support equipment, et cetera, there is an advantage to have the training location identical with what you have deployed in the field. Additionally, looking downstream a little way, missiles will be produced and brought into the inventory at the rate of at least ——— per month, from ——— per month, and in the course of time several years beyond that there will need to be some capability of utilizing those missiles because they will reach the point of deterioriation where they should be replaced and ——— is about the minimum number that it would take to adequately build up confidence and experience and use rates with respect to this program.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis for your estimate for your technical support?

Is this based upon this same general principle of procedures you have heretofore addressed yourself to relative to the unit aspect?

Colonel LEONHARD. There is a requirement at the support base for being able to do organizational level maintenance on organic guidance systems, on squibs, on ground equipment that can be done at the organizational level rather than sending it back to the factory or to the depot.

This organizational maintenance point also will permit some rotation in and out of the missiles themselves for periodic check-out and then replace it in the field so that whether you have one squadron or two or three or six, these requirements are substantially the same and

they are minimum requirements you need for this type activity almost regardless of the number of missiles supported from this activity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the difference between this item and the one for base support?

Colonel LEONHARD. The item for the base support contemplates any expansion in existing support accommodations at the selected base, such as I mentioned earlier, the communications requirement. You will have built into this, since this site may be commanding and controlling from ——— missile sites, there will need to be a very significant expansion in the base communications network and perhaps with the additional personnel coming in to man these squadrons, there will be an expanded need for other warehousing and shop space, for the administrative needs as distinguished from the technical needs.

CAPABILITIES OF THE LAUNCH CONTROL CENTERS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your plans call for the deployment of ——— silos for each launch control center, with each LCC having the capability of controlling ———. What is the basis for this ——— ratio?

Colonel DORFMAN. This is on the basis of the war-gaming exercise techniques where we have started out and evaluated what it would cost us in hardness to make the targeting lucrativeness or weight to the enemy out of balance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How firm is this ratio?

Colonel DORFMAN. It is very firm, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you feel at the moment this determination on the ———ratio is going to preclude you from continuity of changing in the MINUTEMAN program as such or do you think this is pretty well resolved at the moment?

In other words, the ATLAS has been changed and the MINUTEMAN we hope is not going to be changed. That is what motivated the question.

Colonel LEONHARD. I think the circumstances are significantly different here and I do feel that this ratio will not be further compromised.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What do you contemplate to be the degree of hardening that you will give to the LCC?

Colonel LEONHARD. The launch control center we are comtemplating hardening to ———.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What degree of hardening do you plan for the facilities in this strategic missile support area?

Colonel LEONHARD. In the strategic missile support area, nothing. These will be soft. I believe I did mention that the launch position we are designing with an objective of ———.

LAND REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD. You referred to your land operations. How do you propose to handle the land requirements? What is the premise that you have in mind at the moment?

Colonel LEONHARD. Well, it is simply a problem of volume and the way that we like it is to get started quicker and we have been working now on the positions established in the Malstrom area for about 4 months now.

We expect to begin the acquisition of land in May, next month, and to have the land in hand with clearance to proceed with construction by the 1st of October.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any options now?

Colonel LEONHARD. At the moment I could not give you a precise answer as regards any particular one of them, but authority was granted, I believe, from the headquarters here to permit the acquisition of land beginning the first of May.

General MINTON. I feel, sir, we cannot give you numbers. We will get the numbers and give them to you before the morning is over or insert them in the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The reason that motivated the question, as I interpret it, is one of immediate requirement and you are trying the best you can, at least that is my opinion, to get this thing in line and keep it pretty consistent in its contractual procedure, et cetera.

If you run against places where you will walk into condemnation obviously it will have a time influence upon your whole program. The lack of options at the moment might indicate you would run into that problem.

Has that been surveyed to any degree in the field so we have any immediate knowledge?

General MINTON. Yes, sir, plus the fact that of course they are not just surveying ——— sites. They are surveying the entire complex of ——— sites with a few added onto that. We may find soil conditions will make it inadvisable to go to a particular location, so that I think there is plenty of leeway to drop out a few of these proposed locations for the individual missile and still end up with ——— launching sites.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you do have enough elasticity in selections to meet that difficulty if you run up against a time element? Some other area?

Colonel LEONHARD. We have alternate sites.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask a question there?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. That land acquisition is not a major item of cost, but it is a significant item of cost. Have you made an effort to locate these sites in areas where you already own sufficient land?

Colonel LEONHARD. This has been one of our criteria, Mr. Sikes: Use Government-owned land wherever it is possible, use land that is not of high value, land that is not in use. We have located on Indian reservations, on public lands held by the Department of Interior, et cetera. We cannot always get all of them on that type land, but part of the reasoning that went into the selection of the Montana-Great Falls area was for this consideration.

VALIDITY OF COST ESTIMATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. There has been a tendency in the past to underestimate costs for new weapons. Just what is the basis for these estimates and how solid do you think they are as presented in your funding request as of the moment?

Colonel LEONHARD. I can assure the chairman of this committee that we will build the ——— operational launchers for the funds we have asked for in this request.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To what extent do you plan to use air support in supplying the operational sites?

Colonel LEONHARD. This is a factor of consideration. The depot supporting MINUTEMAN is at Ogden, Utah, and it is contemplated that air resupply will be employed from that depot location to the support base. Thereafter it will be by road transport from the support base to the launch position.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. SHEPPARD. In checking your justifications, gentlemen, we do not find any cost factors for access roads. What provisions have you made in these estimates for access road costs? Obviously you are going to need them.

Colonel LEONHARD. Again, as part of our criterion on this, and this comes as part of a learning process, early in our sitings of ATLAS and TITAN, and this was done particularly because they were soft, we tried to hide them from public attention and get them at some distance off of public roads. We have reversed that now and our siting criteria for MINUTEMAN, for example, is that they will be no more than 500 feet off of a usable public road and our requirements for use there is that it will be travelable 90 percent of the year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to assume from that you mean you are going to tap into a main highway if one is available, or you will run parallel to it?

Colonel LEONHARD. I did not mean parallel. We will tap into the nearest public road. These will be within 500 feet of our selected sites.

Mr. GIBBENS. The amounts for the access roads for the missiles will be contained in our regular access roads account which will come up later.

Colonel LEONHARD. This is access road improvement. What we have shown in the dollar amounts here are the new roads to connect from our launch site to the nearest public highway. They are included in our amounts here. In addition as Mr. Gibbens points out, there is a program for public road improvement, money that is given to the Bureau of Public Roads to widen or strengthen a pavement or put in a new culvert or something like this.

This money is in a separate justification in this bill.

COST OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. SHEPPARD. What provisions have you made in these estimates for communication costs, such as cable?

Colonel LEONHARD. That is not in this appropriation, Mr. Chairman. We have provided in this appropriation only for the terminal facilities. The actual cable costs will be in the general supply appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What prompted the question is your cable requirements appear in procurement. My question is, Why are you putting construction work in a procurement account? What is the story back of that and why? In other words, if you are going to have construction items you include all construction components in the construction

category so it can be reviewed accordingly instead of having one in procurement and one in another place. What is the purpose of that kind of procedure?

Colonel LEONHARD. This is foreign to me that such things as cabling for communications has ever been——

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are going to have to bury the cable, are you not? I assume you are.

Colonel LEONHARD. This will be direct burial. There is not going to be any conduits or anything like that. This is simply direct burial cable. I do not know of any case to my knowledge where such costs have been included in the military construction program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Because you do not know of it does it not preclude the possibility that it should fall within the category, does it?

Colonel LEONHARD. It does not.

General MINTON. It is direct buried cable. We have a problem with land acquisition for it. We haven't quite worked that out. We do not know exactly how it is going. There is also a possibility that it will be commercial cable that will be used rather than Government procured cable. I do not know. If there is a land procurement problem it becomes our responsibility. There will be no conduit for the cable to go through, there will be no construction per se.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When do you contemplate this will be resolved insofar as the utilization of cable laid by the military itself and under its control versus that being laid by private industry?

Colonel LEONHARD. This is a problem that is being reviewed now at the Secretary of Defense level, Mr. McGuire, with the Air Force in terms of whether such lines will be commercially owned and operated and leased or whether they will be Government placed. This decision has not been made to my knowledge.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it assumed, gentlemen, that in a procedure of this character—and I address this to you, General—you issue a contract for one of these projects. Is the same contractor employed to bury this cable?

General MINTON. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, you issue a completely different contract for that specific purpose?

General MINTON. Yes, sir.

This contractor may get the contract, but he will get it in competition with other bidders.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That will be a segregation from the master contract, for example?

Colonel LEONHARD. If this is done by the Government, it would be handled by GEEIA, which is a part of AMC, having to do with all land line communications and it does not come in our province at all.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to congratulate the chairman on his choice of language, in his use of the word "segregate." That appeals to me. That is the first time in 3 years anybody has said anything about that around here.

PERSONNEL SUPPORT FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, what do you propose to do about the personnel support facilities, gentlemen?

Colonel LEONHARD. Again, part of our site selection criteria is to locate these in such places that the support base already has sufficient

housing capacity and messing and administrative capacity. I am not prepared at the moment to say that this will always necessarily apply but in the sites that we have selected in our ICBM programs to date for ATLAS, TITAN and MINUTEMAN, have required, with only a few relatively minor exceptions, no expansion in personnel facilities. As you know, other elements of the Air Force are reducing to provide the manpower needed for the missile force and this uncovers facilities available for this purpose.

GUIDANCE AND CONTROL DEVELOPMENT CONTRACT

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the present status of the guidance and control development contract for your missiles?

Colonel LEONHARD. This is the contract I would assume you mean with Autonetics?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Colonel LEONHARD. This is a real going operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much is it behind schedule at the moment?

Colonel LEONHARD. I cannot comment on that, sir. I do not know.

Colonel DORFMAN. The contract is in the production phase, Mr. Chairman. The testing on the high speed test track at Holloman AFB is progressing on schedule. If there is any reference to a possibility of slippage, we actually do not believe there is any slippage in the production program. There have been small troubles in initiating the production line on some of the components. We have gotten over these humps.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The information we have is that there is a delay in here of 6 to 8 weeks at the present time.

Colonel DORFMAN. The schedule we are living with and the one I am referring to is the flight test schedule, the first flight test scheduled ——— which should be on time.

There were component delivery slippages but we will have the finished system for flight test in ———.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, as I interpret your response, delays that have been created have been caused only by the fact of delayed components?

Colonel DORFMAN. No, sir; there is a very complicated piece of equipment and the normal slippages that occur in establishing a production line—these are the types of devices that are done in antiseptic rooms, with masks and special clothing and we have had the usual troubles of getting lint in the rooms and the gros not meeting specifications in the early phase last December and things of this type. These are being cleared up. We are getting production components. The prototype unit is on the sled at Holloman now, has been under test for about 2 months and the production prototype for the flight test will be on time, sir.

DESIGN OF SILO LID

Mr. SHEPPARD. The information the committee has obtained on these operations would make it appear that one of your major problems is in designing and constructing a lid for the silo which is capable against tampering and withstanding the overpressures but still will be ca-

pable of rapid operation for launch purposes. What is happening in your design operation having to do with this area?

Colonel LEONHARD. We have examined and have verified with our senior panel of consultants who are recognized as experts in their field, and this panel of consultant includes Drs. Newmark and Peak from the University of Illinois, Drs. Hansen and Whitman from MIT, Drs. Sussels and Barton from STL, and there are two possibilities of equal merit and neither one of which poses any problem with regard to the factors that you mentioned. These two concepts are the double bascule operating door and a second is a sliding panel. We are going to select the most economical of the two, and feel that either one of them will adequately serve the purpose.

BASE SUPPORT

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis for your estimate of $13 million for base support?

Colonel LEONHARD. This must be considered simply a factor, based upon the experience we have had in the early squadrons of the ATLAS and TITAN and represents an approximate amount of money that would be needed at Davis Mountain, at McConnell, at Malstrom, and at Ellsworth, Larson, Mountain Home, and Beale.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming from the experience that you have just referred to upon which you created the requirement of $13 million, do you assume there would be some percentage slippage here, either up or down?

Colonel LEONHARD. I feel that the estimate is adequate for the need and we intend to stay within this budgeted amount.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Supposing you found an overlay; what would be the response then?

General MINTON. We cannot spend the money until we come back and get your permission to do so. We will make every effort to do this for less than $13 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What items, generally speaking, are included in this request?

Colonel LEONHARD. I mentioned expansion of base communications, additional shops, and storage facilities associated with the introduction of a new mission onto the base.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much out of this $13 million will be apportioned for MINUTEMAN and how much for TITAN?

Colonel LEONHARD. I think at MINUTEMAN it would be less than $2 million, or about $2 million approximately, and the balance on TITAN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions upon the items that the Chair has reviewed; the gentleman on my right?

MOBILITY OF MINUTEMAN MISSILE

Mr. SIKES. It appears to me that we are not going to achieve the degree of mobility in MINUTEMAN that it has been generally assumed we would have and, as I said earlier, one of the principal advantages of this system is its mobility. ——— the mobile concept gives it quite a bit of attractiveness.

If we are only going to have ——— sites with ——— missiles each, that is not a great amount of mobility.

Colonel LEONHARD. This is only the initial increment, Mr. Sikes. There is no plan within the Air Force to limit the mobile force to ——— trains of ——— missiles each. This is only one squadron.

Mr. SIKES. When is it planned to have ——— trains and what is the ultimate number when the program is complete?

Colonel LEONHARD. I can answer the first one. A squadron of hardened dispersed is ——— missiles with ——— launch control centers. A squadron of mobile is ——— trains of ——— or ——— so you have this relationship.

Mr. SIKES. How many squadrons initially are planned at fixed sites and how many in a mobile configuration?

Colonel LEONHARD. There has been no Department of Defense approved level for MINUTEMAN as there has been for ATLAS and TITAN at 13 and 14 squadrons, which are established and confirmed.

Mr. SIKES. Have you an estimate of the total number of squadrons?

Colonel LEONHARD. I am in the field. I would have to ask someone in Washington.

General MINTON. I will answer that. It is classified information, of course, and will have to be so treated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will be treated accordingly.

General MINTON. The present Presidentially approved program is ——— missiles. The OSD-approved AF program is ——— missiles. This program has not yet been approved by the President. The break of the ——— missiles between mobile and stationary missiles we are not quite certain about yet. It will depend on some developmental tests that are going through, et cetera. The present Air Force objective program is ——— missiles. This is not approved, either.

Mr. SIKES. Do you not know what the separation will be between mobile and fixed squadron?

Colonel RUNYON. Our plan right now is we should have the ——— trains, you are talking about, by about ———. Our objectives are to have ——— trains. That is our force objective that you asked for.

Mr. SIKES. Out of ——— with ——— out of ———.

Colonel RUNYON. This is out of the objective force of ———.

Mr. SIKES. Initially how many squadrons will you have, and how many missiles will there be?

Colonel RUNYON. Initially for the hardened dispersed, as you may know, there are planned to be ——— squadrons of ——— missiles each for a total of ———.

Mr. SIKES. That is ——— trains with ——— missiles each or ———?

Colonel RUNYON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That brings me back to my original statement. This seems a low percentage of mobile missiles.

Colonel LEONHARD. But this is not by design. We are unable to bring in the mobile force quite as quickly as the fixed.

Mr. SIKES. Why?

Colonel LEONHARD. It just is a longer development problem. You have problems of guidance and other equipment that will take about ——— longer, so that the date by which you can bring in the first hardened dispersed site is about ——— earlier than you can bring in

the mobile one and so that you get a quicker start out of the blocks on the hardened dispersed and a later start on mobile.

Mr. LAIRD. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. Why is it more difficult to assemble a squadron in trains than it is to do all of the work which is attendant upon fixed sites?

Colonel LEONHARD. The work that goes on at a fixed site is relatively simple in terms of sophistication as compared with the problems you have with the mobile setup.

Mr. SIKES. But you know where the train sidings are which you are going to use for launch purposes.

Colonel LEONHARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. That is the same as the fixed site once the train is in place.

Colonel LEONHARD. Yes, but there are problems with regard to setting up, ———, control and things of this nature. This has been worked on very carefully.

Mr. SIKES. I wish you would submit for the record a more realistic analysis of this situation.

Colonel DORFMAN. The answer is that the mobile MINUTEMAN system is a separate, complete weapons system. All of its components have to be integrated to be made into an operational entity.

(Discussion off the record.)

The Air Force objective is to get the mobile system as fast as possible in the numbers that we think are desirable.

Mr. SIKES. That seems to be a reasonable answer.

Now, tell me this: Why do you plan for only ——— trains or ——— missiles initially as compared to ——— squadrons of fixed sites with a total of ——— missiles? Why do you not achieve a greater degree of mobility initially?

Colonel DORFMAN. It again, sir, is the timing. In other words——

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JONAS. Would you yield, Mr. Sikes?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Laird asked me to yield.

Mr. LAIRD. My question is on that one point.

Isn't the answer to the question that instead of waiting until the mobile units are ready, you want to get some fixed units? You think you can put them in place in the interim?

Colonel DORFMAN. Yes, sir. The largest buildup in missiles in the time that we have, and we can get them in the ground faster than we can get them on the road. This is the answer.

Mr. SIKES. Let me ask you something about cost comparisons between mobile and fixed units. Do you have any estimates on that at this time?

Colonel LEONHARD. Mobile force is more expensive, not only in initial investment, but in annual operating costs, obviously.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Whitten?

Mr. WHITTEN. You referred to this mobile unit. You referred to trains. Of what does the train consist? How many cars are there in the train?

What is involved in this reference to a train?

Colonel RUNYON. Part of this, I think, was touched on a moment ago. Basically, as you know, there is that part of the train that is considered the housekeeping portion. This is the sleeping cars, messing, et cetera. In addition to that, there will be cars which will contain powerpacks and the communications. The specialized equipment that goes directly with the missile is the launch control car and the launch cars themselves.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the missile occupy one car?

Colonel RUNYON. Yes, sir.

Colonel LEONHARD. Each missile, one car.

Mr. WHITTEN. We referred to mobility. The rail lines are rather definitely established. The Russians could get, without purchase, I suppose, a map of all the rail lines that we have in this country. Presumably in any attack they might make, attention doubtless would be given to rail centers in this country. How much mobility is involved in this plan? Are we going to have the weapon on a train and station the train at a particular place? Did I understand you to say that a while ago, or is this something you will move around over the country from time to time?

Colonel LEONHARD. It will be moving around at such a rate as to always be shorter than the intelligence cycle. At the time you pull into a siding, how long would it take for word of that to get back to the Kremlin and translate it into a target package in the guidance system of their ICBM and get delivery of that over this country? This may be measured in hours, in days, and it is something that will change, I am sure, with the evolution of time.

Mr. WHITTEN. On a deal like that, then, you would be moving these around periodically from place to place. Is there anything in the outward appearance of this train that would make it any different in order to carry the weapons that would be quite evident to the public?

Colonel LEONHARD. These can be pretty well screened.

Mr. WHITTEN. What do you mean "pretty well"? How much distance up in the air will the weapon stick up?

Colonel LEONHARD. They will not be higher at all than the ordinary boxcar.

Mr. WHITTEN. If these are on one car and if you are seeking mobility, what is the difference between the use of the rail car and a truck?

Colonel LEONHARD. Well, we had thought in terms of mobility.

Mr. WHITTEN. A truck is more mobile and certainly it does not attract the attention of the public and certainly with the highways, it would be more difficult for the Russians to be fully informed of them. If the unit itself is only one boxcar, a truck could well carry it, and I should think you could have these related things on a truck.

Colonel LEONHARD. On different trucks, yes. It would take a caravan of trucks, the same as you have a string of cars on the rail line.

Mr. WHITTEN. Was any consideration given to that, or any comparison given to the cost?

Colonel LEONHARD. We found it to be more expensive truck mounted than rail mounted. We also looked at barges on navigable streams, et cetera, and if we go to mobility, as we have, the most economical choice is rail and the country is pretty well blanketed with primary and secondary and tertiary lines.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have many rail lines in this country.

Colonel RUNYON. As Colonel Leonhard has said, an extensive study has been made in this regard for all methods of mobility. We have not given up looking for all methods of mobility that might be open to us.

As far as rail is concerned, our studies now indicate there is something on the order of about ——— miles of rail open to us to meet our concept. There is more rail than this but about ——— miles is open to us for this particular concept.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is not ability to move weapons to places where you want to defend; is it? Is it merely a means of moving weapons to prevent their being destroyed?

Colonel RUNYON. The last statement is correct. It is to increase targeting problems for the enemy. Even if he located these trains it would increase the number of missiles he would have to use.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is it any more vulnerable than the MINUTEMAN?

Colonel RUNYON. The MINUTEMAN is in the hole. It has built-in protection. If it is laying on a car it is——

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the question that comes to my mind, whether it is not more vulnerable this way. Can you move it around frequently enough?

Colonel RUNYON. Yes; it is certainly a factor.

Mr. WHITTEN. In civil defense on some of these side roads they state, "This highway may be closed in the event of emergency." It made the American people very aware of Russian danger and supported defense spending. I have seen this sign in areas of this country where you would waste a firecracker if you shot it there, much less one of the high-priced weapons.

In moving these rail cars around the country periodically as against having these fixed bases, is there any element of that involved?

As the chairman pointed out, you are putting the big shots in the fixed bases where they are much better protected and it would seem to be an easier job in sighting and doing all those things you need to do as against a rail car where, with all due deference to the railroads, I have not seen many where the roadbed was much less than completely level.

I have a serious question in my mind as to whether this is a good thing as against putting in a fixed protected site not only for much less money but with perhaps better protection.

General MINTON. I have been in on this planning and I assure you there has been no fault to find there. The mobile MINUTEMAN program is a desirable and economical weapon considering what we get for it. ——— but the mobile concept gives us the possibility of locating ——— missiles at a dozen different places, and it is difficult for the enemy to determine at what spot it may be at any one time.

Mr. WHITTEN. That sounds good, but someone answered earlier we would have to move them often enough so it would make it difficult for the enemy. If it is a day or 2 days, it means you will be moving a train every 2 days; so it means the trains will be on the run all the time, would it not?

General MINTON. It also may be we need to move it only 5 miles to another site.

Mr. WHITTEN. Then these Russian weapons are not near as potent as we have been led to believe.

General MINTON. We can move it 10 miles. Distance does not make a great deal of difference. This would certainly complicate the problem for the enemy. We would not want to do what we did at Pearl Harbor, have a set schedule for patrol so that the enemy can anticipate well ahead of time where any particular missile might be at any particular time.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think that is true. The rail lines are well along in this country so you can get into any station you want.

However, you have to go in the direction the rail lines go. You can move it forward or backward but not sideways, so you are certainly limited in your mobility. How about trucks?

General MINTON. We actually made studies and had war games as to the various capabilities of Russian missiles and the number of Russian missiles necessary to destroy one of these trains under certain concepts of moving them up and down, 75- to 250-mile stretches of track. I do not recall the numbers offhand, but they are fantastic.

Colonel LEONHARD. You do not have to run up the main line of the Southern Pacific Railroad. You can go off into the UP or take another turn. Actually, you have then two dimensions of area that the enemy would have to target and not just the main line.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is only about 50 percent as much leeway as you would have by highway. This is the first time I have learned of this and that is why I ask these questions. Some may appear simple.

I still think if mobility is what is sought that big trucks could offer mobility far beyond the railroad tracks.

Colonel RUNYON. The question of highway mobility has been and is continuing to be looked at. It was studied carefully prior to the time we made a decision to start out with the missile mobility concept on rail cars.

Mr. WHITTEN. It means you will end up with about ——— trains you will be moving every 2 or 3 days at a minimum and probably every 6 or 8 hours.

Colonel RUNYON. It could well be. The nature of moving is what confounds the enemy's target system.

Colonel LEONHARD. If we had 100 trains, and there are 90,000 miles of railroads usable, this eliminates railroads around major cities, that allocates 900 miles of track per train.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all.

Mr. JONAS. I have no further questions.

PERSONNEL SUPPORT FACILITIES

Mr. LAIRD. I was interested in the question the chairman asked about personnel support facilities for the various missile squadrons. In any of these squadrons that are programed you do not contemplate any personnel facilities. Is that correct?

Colonel LEONHARD. That is correct. We did early in the game restore Vandenberg from a World War II mobilization type base into a permanent installation, and we built one or two barracks at Offutt out of this program in 1958, but nothing since that time.

Mr. LAIRD. Is this true of all future programs?

Colonel LEONHARD. This is the way we visualize it at this time; yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. You are not limiting that just to Air Force personnel facilities, are you?

Colonel LEONHARD. We do not visualize any support, any personnel facilities, to be coming out of this particular appropriation.

Mr. LAIRD. For MINUTEMAN, TITAN, or ATLAS?

Colonel LEONHARD. That is correct.

MOBILITY OF MINUTEMEN MISSILES

Mr. LAIRD. How long does it take you to set up to fire one of these mobile MINUTEMEN missiles?

Colonel LEONHARD. It has not been done and will not be done for

———.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand that, but certainly you have plans and programs on this? You must have some estimate.

Colonel LEONHARD. If that is the question, we can give you an answer.

Mr. LAIRD. I realize you have not fired the MINUTEMAN, but I speak of how long you contemplate you can set up to fire.

Colonel LEONHARD. I think that the answer to your question would have to be given in three ways.

One, if you are on the designated fire spot, how long does it take to launch the missile?

No. 2, if you are in the siding and not set up, how long does it take?

Mr. LAIRD. I will give you a question, then. When the train arrives at the siding, how long does it take you after the train arrives?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. LAIRD. How long would it take you if you had this MINUTEMAN missile upon an LST?

Colonel DORFMAN. Depending on the configuration, if it were laying horizontally, it would take at least as much time if not longer.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not talking about laying horizontally but I refer to being fixed and ready to fire on an LST where you cannot do that on a railroad train.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. LAIRD. You could not have it placed in position in an LST, in a ready position?

(Discussion off the record.)

Colonel LEONHARD. The missile would not stand the extremes of temperature that you might be subjected to on the deck of a ship or anywhere else that is open. You must surround it with a cocoon or keep it in some environmental enclosure.

Mr. LAIRD. I am interested in this: It does not seem to me you are getting the real mobility you speak of with the MINUTEMAN missile. It certainly is not as mobile as the POLARIS concept of the Navy, for example. You have to be at some fixed spot according to your discussion of today.

Colonel LEONHARD. At this time, yes, sir. You must be at some preengineered location.

Mr. LAIRD. Have any of you been out on the *George Washington*?

Colonel LEONHARD. I have not.

Mr. LAIRD. It is not necessary for them to be at any prefixed spot before they fire.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. LAIRD. What about using navigation satellites to tell where you are?

Colonel LEONHARD. Of course, all of these things are possibilities when they come into being. They would be applicable on land the same as they are at sea.

Mr. LAIRD. You think there is some question about the navigation satellite?

Colonel LEONHARD. I say when they come into being.

Mr. LAIRD. The navigation satellite is practically in being.

Colonel LEONHARD. As an R. and D. vehicle.

Mr. LAIRD. You do not think you can plan it?

Colonel LEONHARD. This is out of my field, Mr. Laird. I don't know whether the United States plans to keep them up there on an operational status or not. I do not know.

Mr. LAIRD. It would seem to me that in your planning for mobility this would have something to do with it. Perhaps I do not understand this thoroughly.

Of course, I have gotten briefing from the POLARIS concept and perhaps there is something wrong with it. Is there?

Colonel LEONHARD. No, there is nothing wrong with it.

Colonel DORFMAN. Sir, there is a simple answer to part of your question.

As I stated earlier, the MINUTEMAN mobile concept was predicated on using existing equipment which had been developed for the fixed and hard system. (Discussion off the record).

Mr. LAIRD. I understand on the POLARIS they can change it in———.

Colonel DORFMAN. No, sir. If this is true we do not know about it. I should not have said "No," rather if it is true we do not know about it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you will find on reviewing the statements that they have a comparability in both of those operations, to wit, POLARIS, which is different structurally speaking, as against what we are talking about here. They both have to have a definitized geographical area.

Colonel LEONHARD. Within a small area.

I think the necessity for this navigational system might be more urgent in the case of POLARIS than it is in MINUTEMAN because, without such a thing, knowledge of the precise location is not as well defined obviously as a railroad network in this country.

If we have sufficient flexibility in moving these trains around so as to achieve an effective mobile concept, and if we know the precise geographical locations of our launch positions along these tracks, this is ideal.

Mr. LAIRD. What I am interested in is getting these missiles out of the United States. It seems to me the Air Force is proceeding on a policy of making the major target of the Russians the continental United States.

Colonel LEONHARD. I think that would be subject to discussion. If the Soviets have an arsenal of ICBM's, as everyone claims they have,

what are they going to use them against? Do you think they are going to sit idly still in their country and receive attack from the United States and our allies and not use them against this country? If they are not directed——

Mr. LAIRD. Our war plans evidently are drawn up on a different basis, that we will merely retaliate. If you will strike the first blow you would think they would strike at our missile bases. Perhaps they will not but I would think they would go for the missile bases rather than the cities.

Colonel LEONHARD. They will not be using their ICBM's against our POLARIS force. If they have ICBM's the only thing they can use them for is against the country. They will use them against the hardened ICBM sites or against our cities.

General MINTON. I think I can answer your question.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe that the Air Force position is that they will use them against our ICBM bases. If that is not the position we are making a mistake with all this hardening.

Colonel LEONHARD. If we did not have our hardened ICBM bases in this country there would be only one target left, and that would be our cities.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you believe this hardening is forcing them to go for our cities?

Colonel LEONHARD. No, sir. It gives them, then, a useful target for their ICBM's rather than our cities.

General MINTON. Our purpose in hardening, as we pointed out last January, is as a retaliatory and deterrent force. Our purpose is not to draw attack on the United States. Our purpose is to prevent that.

We think providing enough missiles so that the enemy does not have a chance in the world of survival, regardless of the number of missiles he may have in his arsenal, there will be no war, at least no attack.

POTENTIAL SITES FOR MINUTEMAN MISSILES

Mr. LAIRD. What consideration have you given to using some of the natural sites that we have in the United States which are pretty well protected because of the configuration of the area involved? I refer to some of our canyons in the West, for example. They have very small openings in some cases.

Colonel LEONHARD. We are conscious of this. It is a matter of selecting the proper siting criteria when these forces are deployed in a country.

On the one hand it would be well to place these units in the deserts of the West. Then you have the problem of course, of how you will support the operation, how you will get reenlistments in the service, building new support bases and personnel facilities, and everything else that goes with it. You have to balance that against the problems associated with locating these forces around existing support bases.

Mr. LAIRD. It is a question somewhat of morale, then? You speak of reenlistment rates. I thought perhaps it was a morale problem.

General MINTON. Not primarily.

Colonel LEONHARD. It is a factor.

General MINTON. We have made a formal study of just about every conceivable type of location for a fixed force. We have studied lime-

stone mines, for instance, these large underground excavations, studied putting them in deserts, as Colonel Leonhard pointed out, canyons out West, and balanced all those against an initial investment of building up a community for 1,000 to 1,200 people in a desert.

In the scheme we have now I think we have the most megatons available against the enemy for the amount of money we have had to spend.

I will repeat we have made a formal investigation of each one of these possibilities. Our architects and engineers have studied those possibilities. We have had private corporations make studies on the question of vulnerability as against the dollar expenditures.

Mr. LAIRD. You are convinced the best policy for us to follow is to go through with the hardening of these bases?

General MINTON. Absolutely.

Colonel LEONHARD. The most significant thing is dispersal. You harden only to make economically feasible the dispersal concept.

Dispersal is the key to this, we feel, in terms of force survivability.

In order not to scatter the force to uneconomical extremes of distance from a support base you harden the force to permit the concentration of it.

Mr. LAIRD. It seems to me we will look back on this 5 or 6 years from now and question how we could have made some of the decisions we are making this year and made last year, particularly with your SKY BOLT, HOUND DOG, and your other mobile concepts which are not as complicated as this. You have all these holes in the ground all over the United States, and I think we will be in a position where it will look rather foolish after it has been done.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MOBILITY OF MINUTEMAN MISSILE

Mr. SHEPPARD. The subcommittee will come to order.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to know how many sites you anticipate for the —— trains and then for the —— trains and generally the points where you will park these trains. How many such points do you anticipate having for the ——— and how many later for the ———

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Are you planning to acquire land and to build such spurs, or are you planning to look to the railroads for what they already have?

Colonel DORFMAN. Sir, we do not plan building any spurs for the deployment points where they will stop. They will use existing spurs. These are spurs now that run off into the woods in some areas where there are cutover forests, spurs that were used to abandoned mine pits, and so forth.

Mr. WHITTEN. That sounds very good, but it does not sound to me much like you have studied the rail system. I just do not believe you are going to find that many abandoned spurs. It has been my observation that once a spur line is no longer in use, the railroad company takes it up and makes use of it at some other place. Have you made a study and can you show us any specific check you have made and where these are?

Colonel DORFMAN. Sir, we are working at the present time with the Association of American Railroads and the operating vice presidents of the western lines on a continuous committee basis. We are also working with MTMA and with the Transportation Corps of the Army.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are working, but I do not see anything specific. The question comes up with me, I think one of the reasons we get so little defense sometimes for the dollar and one of the reasons we cannot hold the cost down is that it becomes the catchall for all kinds of subsidization. Where are you going to get these trains? Who are you going to pay for them? How much are you going to pay the railroads for having trains running over their lines the year round? I would like to have some money figures here. It is looking more and more like that to me, frankly.

Colonel DORFMAN. I will pass the question to Colonel Runyon, but first one sentence on what I reviewed over my desk at lunch today. We do have estimates in from the Transportation Corps on the available rail rolling stock that is in the war reserve. We shall use this to the maximum, and there is a very minimal amount which is the specialized launch cars that we will have to buy.

Mr. WHITTEN. You speak very well, but every word I have heard you use so far is generalities. I have not had anything specific. You are meeting with people. You are dealing with this. You hope to use that. But I do not have figure one, except ——— and ———. You plan to have ——— trains and then you plan to have ———.

Colonel DORFMAN. Sir, I do not have the numbers on this. We can insert this in the record.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to know about it. You know stuff gets buried in the record. We are so busy we cannot go back and thumb through this. Do you mean you do not have it?

Colonel DORFMAN. No, sir. The Air Force has the number. We do not have it here in Washington. It is available on the west coast. We will get it. If you wish, we will make a report to you, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to have it. Is this rolling stock trains which belong to the Government already?

Colonel DORFMAN. Yes, sir; they are in storage right now.

Mr. WHITTEN. How many do you have in storage?

Colonel DORFMAN. I do not know the number, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. How about the conversion of the average freight car? Is this an open car such as you haul sand and gravel and pipe on?

Colonel DORFMAN. No, sir. These are covered cars.

Mr. WHITTEN. Can you remodel those cars, such as taking the roof off?

Colonel DORFMAN. We have the costs on that. We have an estimate which has been provided by the Transportation Corps.

Mr. WHITTEN. How old are these cars? Are they satisfactory rolling stock?

Colonel RUNYON. If I may, sir, I hope I shall be able to be more than general in answer to some of the questions you just asked. As far as the rolling stock itself is concerned, as we explained this morning, the majority of the equipment is standard equipment already in

existence. Some of this is equipment which the Army has, for instance. The only really specialized equipment is the missile launcher, which has to be built. This is part of the time that was discussed this morning.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am trying to direct myself away from your weapons system. I am talking about the rolling stock. Are you going to have to buy these freight cars or do you have them? If the Army has them, have they declared them surplus and are they available to you, or do you just hope to get them? What is the cost of converting one of these cars? Next, I want to know, are you going to build any spur lines? As I understand, these weapons would have to be fixed at definite spots, if I understood the testimony correctly.

Colonel RUNYON. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. In pulling off, they have to follow a spur line track?

Colonel RUNYON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. You do not plan to build any spur lines?

Colonel RUNYON. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. You will use available spur lines?

Colonel RUNYON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. This will be your train and you will operate the engines, or is that something you will have a train crew to do?

Colonel RUNYON. Our current planning—this is in the planning stage.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you plan to have them on the run for 2 weeks and then the train off for a week?

Colonel RUNYON. The crew, sir, the military crew, the operating personnel. The train will pull in to its home base and be restocked and the missiles will be rechecked and all repairs will be done. That is a matter of ———. It will then go out with a new crew.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Am I to interpret from you answer to the gentleman from Mississippi that you are going to use railroad crews of military background?

Colonel RUNYON. No, sir, we do not know the backgrounds of the people other than a security check. This will be run.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean from the time you leave the main line, or do you mean on the main line?

Colonel RUNYON. All the time, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At all times?

Colonel RUNYON. In other words, we will order a locomotive to come in and pick up our consist and pull us out to our next point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Right, When it comes to the operation, the engineers, the brakemen, the switchmen, and so forth, then what?

Colonel RUNYON. The engineers, switchmen, brakemen, and the normal rail crew will have to be civilian crews, according to our current planning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The reason I ask these questions is that the railroads are under contract with the operators of the roads. Obviously, you have either to cut away from that by some special operation or to use those crews.

Colonel RUNYON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When you use those crews, then you are subjected to the contractual procedures those crews have to operate under.

Colonel RUNYON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are subject to the dispatcher's orders and to transportation, which means they can say, "All right, this is a red ball operation," which means preferential.

Colonel RUNYON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They will put everything aside to take care of this from here to here, geographically. So you are in a specialized category, with one reservation: It is the railroad crews that run the actual operation of the trains. You run what happens with the military concept of it.

Colonel RUNYON. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From your answer to the gentleman from Mississippi, that was not quite clear. You have to live with that, whether you like it or not, do you not?

Colonel RUNYON. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Pursuing that a little further, what you mean, then, is that you are going to have a flatcar or boxcar and you will enter a contract with the railroad company to furnish motive power.

Colonel RUNYON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. And he, in turn, will doubtless furnish the operating crew.

Colonel RUNYON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. It means, then, that that must be merged in with the overall operation of the railroad systems. The main line of the Santa Fe or the Illinois Central or one of the other big lines must match their operations to have ——— Government trains running around at all times all over the country. In Washington, due to the dangers incident to the local airport, and elsewhere in the country, we are told that when military flying is merged or meshed in with the operation of the private airlines, there is a real hazard and it creates problems.

First, I would like to know what you are going to pay these railroads, what your estimated cost will be for ——— engines and ——— crews; then what you will pay them for having ——— freight trains running around over our railroads at all times.

Colonel RUNYON. We will provide this to you, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you have a rough estimate now? I just cannot conceive that you have no idea about it. I repeat, I begin to wonder if perhaps subsidization of the railroads is not a factor.

General MINTON. We are having a very detailed study made of this, as you may remember from our testimony this morning.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is a mighty good place to bring the results, General, if I may be so bold as to say so.

General MINTON. We did not anticipate this question. This will not be out of military construction funds. We will make the information available.

Mr. WHITTEN. This committee may want to know what the overall operating costs will be before we determine to buy a package, if we do not know where it leads.

General MINTON. I did not anticipate that or we would have had the information for you.

Mr. WHITTEN. You will interfere with railroad traffic. Trucks are by far a better thing. One, you get away from operating crews. You rent motive power. You keep ——— trains from being mixed

into your general railroad operation. I would like a study and report on all these comparisons. If what you have in any unit can be put in one railroad car, it can well be put in one big truck, which gives you much more lateral motion. It does not limit you to spur lines. Neither does it upset the orderly movement of domestic commerce. I think it would be well, Mr. Chairman, to have all that information for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I may say to my colleague, there is one aspect that I think is important: We cannot disregard the fact that while the trucks might be more applicable economically and otherwise, we still have a truck formula of cost factors. The truck drivers today are in the same general position as the railroad employees under contracts. They have contracts. They will run these trucks so many hours for so much money. That is what the drivers have. The drivers have so many people to go aboard that truck. Whether we like it or not, that is a part of the contractual obligation.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am very familiar with that, Mr. Chairman. I am not trying to take any brief here as between trucks and railroads. I wish them both well. That does not enter into my consideration. Military vehicles are operated by military personnel every time you turn around. I see that everywhere. If you were running a common carrier, you probably would have to deal with the unions and all that, but military equipment is operated by military personnel all over the country. So we do not necessarily have to face that.

What I am saying is that before this committee buys a package of procurement, certainly we should have before us the full story on both sides of this thing for whatever it may be worth. If this is to run to your making an annual payment to the railroad companies for running ——— trains or ——— trains, I think this committee is entitled to know what the amount is. I think also trains running about all over the country continuously will create some serious problems in connection with the orderly movement of domestic commerce on the railroads. Whatever the facts are, we do not have them and we need them.

Colonel RUNYON. Sir, I think the questions you ask certainly point to the need to answer them, and also some kind of briefing, because you have covered a multitude of very——

Mr. WHITTEN. Do not say "sins," but I was wondering myself about that.

Colonel RUNYON. In any event, at the risk of being a bit general, may I add a few thoughts that might be worthwhile. We certainly will get the information you have asked for.

We have studied the program carefully. I do not happen to have the figures on the difference, but the program has been studied very carefully as to the use of a truck-type convoy versus the use of railroad. The cost, the practicality, the scheduling have been such that it appears much more attractive to go by rail.

Some of the points you raise, such as trains going around, and so forth, of course are a matter of scheduling. We have had conversations with the railroad people, and they have assured us that they feel this sort of thing can be worked out without causing undue interference. You would have the same problem on the roads unless

you worked it out. You have busy highways and busy access roads.

Mr. WHITTEN. My observation is that the military can bull on through and local traffic just does the best it can. I have experienced that myself sometimes.

Colonel RUNYON. I have one other thought in this area. We intend to avoid the very congested areas the best we can.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know the railroads can do what you are talking about. In other words, if the volume of their business were to increase so they could run another ——— trains, I am sure they would find ways to run them. If you pay them enough, I am sure they will find some way to do it. I want to know how much you expect to pay them.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can tell you right now, under the regulations existing as far as railroad transportation is concerned, any time you want a special train you will pay the special train rate under the regulatory requirements already in existence by those who write the rates. The rates are already established, whether it is common freight, passenger service, special service, or red ball service. That is already in evidence. You will pay those costs whether you like it or not, because it is established by regulation.

Mr. WHITTEN. The only yardstick we have so far, Mr. Chairman, is that they say to put one of these missiles on the train, if I remember correctly, the estimated cost is several times greater.

Colonel DORFMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. If that has to do with the cost of construction and putting the cars in proper shape and putting it there rather than putting it in the ground, that is one thing. If the ——— does not include the cost of rail transportation, movement, power, then it is a horse of a different color. I do not think we have much of anything before us at the present moment.

General MINTON. We will get the information for you.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all.

(Off the record.)

General HOLLOWAY. The question is which of the two, rail or road, looks to be the most attractive for MINUTEMAN.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not attractive; the most operational and the most economical. If you want to call that attractive, that is all right.

General HOLLOWAY. In the case of MINUTEMAN, the weights and sizes are such that the road truck application looks to be most uneconomical and less attractive operationally than the railroad. The weights would mean beefing up, you might say, thousands of bridges—I do not know how many it would be—raising many clearances, getting out-size vehicles. It would involve a lot of regulations and negotiation with various States along with all these changes. These make it look almost out of the question, we feel, from our point of view, for a weapon this size.

Mr. WHITTEN. If I may interrupt at this point, General, we realize when you make a decision, everybody is supposed to support it. If you are to use railroads, there is nothing more standard than a boxcar. If you are to use railroads, nothing is more standard than a railroad bridge. Anybody is familiar with that from just observing railroad cars and present-day trucks, clearances, widths, and things like that. Certainly I do not believe you have any facts to support the statement you just made.

When it comes to highway bridges, that would be a factor, but it is a generality you have given. I would like to know the weight of this weapon. I would like you to supply for the record the weights that some of these heavy trucks do carry. Your general statement here does not carry any weight with me. Boxcars are just as standard and railroad bridges are just as low as highway bridges. Certainly highways are wider than many of these areas of the railroad right-of-way. Many railroads have another track running beside them. Some of the highways at least have some room. You move very big vehicles by highway now. You have somebody out in front clearing the way. You cannot even do that on the railroad.

General HOLLOWAY. That is right, sir. I am talking about not the boxcar as the primary element——

Mr. WHITTEN. What is there about this bridge business?

General HOLLOWAY. I am talking about the launcher car that the missile itself goes into and the associated equipment for launching it, which does add weight.

Mr. WHITTEN. They cannot stick it out over the side and cannot stick it out the top on the railroad. You would not have that problem on the highway. If you can put it in a standard boxcar——

General HOLLOWAY. You cannot do that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Someone told us they could.

General HOLLOWAY. Not the launching car.

Colonel RUNYON. The statement we made to the committee was that the train is composed to a great extent of standard cars which can be grouped in the housekeeping category, if you will, such as the pullman type, mess cars, and so forth. The cars which are peculiar to the system itself are the launch car and the launch control car.

Mr. WHITTEN. How wide and how tall do they have to be?

Colonel RUNYON. The width I think would probably be standard.

Mr. WHITTEN. The height?

Colonel RUNYON. I would say the height is standard also.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now the length?

Colonel RUNYON. The length will be different.

Mr. WHITTEN. What is the length?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, almost as long as some of these trailers you pass going down to friend Sikes' country in the spring. To try to get by it on the highway——

Mr. SIKES. I should think weight would be the principal factor.

General HOLLOWAY. It is, but on the back roads and other roads, to get full advantage of the road network as we discussed earlier, there would have to be a lot of beefing up. Details are available.

Mr. SHEPPARD. One question is involved here. One is standardized, and the other is not. You have no highway in the United States today that is a standardized highway, outside of the major highways under Federal scope. All the subsidiary highways are not standardized, but are subject to county or State control. Every railroad in the country is standardized. Is that right or not?

General HOLLOWAY. Certainly every railroad in the United States that I know of that we would use is standard gage; yes, sir, and standard heights on bridges.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Can you show me anything outside of the major highways that are standardized in the roads?

General HOLLOWAY. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the answer.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. I do not mind listening to argument about the weight. I do not profess to know. When you reach out and bring in all these other things which it is quite patent do not support your statement, I think I should ask my question to show width and height as factors. Weight may be a factor. The standards the chairman has raised are standards toward restriction so far as railroads are concerned. I am talking about space. When it comes to weight, if you check the highways—and I am no expert in this field—more and more States now have worked out standards for the interstate systems and the use of weights. You could show here the highway systems of the various States and the weight load limits. It may be yours is over the limit. I do not know. It seems weight is the only factor that would lend any weight to your argument.

General FRIEDMAN. Mr. Whitten, I think you have asked some pertinent questions. I think the facts are available. That being the case, there is no reason why they should not be made available. Here are the factors, and the point you bring out can be made available.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have no further questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When we recessed this morning, some of the original questions had not been answered because the witnesses were not available.

What is the status of funds for the ballistic missile program, including funds authorized, appropriated, delegated, or expended?

(Additional information appears on p. 596.)

Colonel EDMONDS. During the noon hour I was furnished the following figures, Mr. Chairman. The total authorization to date is $1,023,614,000, which does not include authorization for planning, which is open and permanent authorization. The total appropriation is $1,067,391,000, which does include our planning figure because we could not break out the obligation separately.

Obligations as of March 31, 1960, $779,480,000; expenditures as of March 31, 1960, $398,594,000.

COUNTERFORCE REQUIRED BY UNITED STATES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Based on the national intelligence estimates regarding the Soviet missile capabilities, what counterforce is required by the United States if that is evidenced for the basis of your evaluation of your presentation?

General HOLLOWAY. Our current program, Mr. Chairman, is based on 14 squadrons of TITAN, 13 squadrons of ATLAS.

This, we feel, will provide a respectable counterforce capability. It is not in accordance with the best intelligence estimates. The optimum figure or optimum amount——

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the counterforce required, based on Air Force intelligence estimates, if there is a difference?

General HOLLOWAY. There is a difference, Mr. Chairman, in the two estimates. The counterforce required in order to give a good feeling for an absolute requirement based on either estimate would take a considerable amount of time and briefing. There is no quick answer to it. It would be greater than that required against the national intelligence estimate, and as I stated before, the optimum counterforce requirement is still not met with against either of these estimates.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, taking your joint intelligence emanating from the Air Force, emanating from CIA, and putting them all together for a total, are you meeting the optimum?

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why?

General HOLLOWAY. It is a matter of assessment of priorities of the various elements of our counterforce weapons stable to achieve flexibility and overall reliability as well as other factors that have to make up the force against the amount of wherewithal that you can reasonably spend to achieve this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, utilizing the word "wherewithal," I assume you are referring to budget consideration?

General HOLLOWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What you are actually doing, while the collection of information over here may mean this, in the final analysis, you have to evaluate the combination of intelligence you have against the dollars you have and then apply it the best you can within the dollar scope?

General HOLLOWAY. That is right, sir.

General FRIEDMAN. I would like to add this, of course, Mr. Chairman, and I have testified along the same lines as General Holloway has just testified as regards the fact that there certainly are dollar considerations.

There are other considerations, however, that I think in all fairness should be brought out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. For instance, what?

General FRIEDMAN. In the instance of the MINUTEMAN program as a specific example, you will recall we testified that as regards the first part of the program, I think up until 1962 or 1963, there isn't much you could do, moneywise, to expedite that part of the schedule. There is, however, a possibility—if our developments proceed in accordance with the plans as we see them now—that with a decision October 1 of this year there would be a possibility of expanding the production rate from ——— per month as currently planned under the budget to ——— per month, which would then give you the optimum program of——— as opposed to the ——— odd which we have discussed under the terms of an approved program. So I think it is a consideration of feasibility and also a desire to have the best quality of missile that we can under the circumstances.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, the control of best possibility of the missile hinges upon the R. & D. and testing, does it not?

General FRIEDMAN. It certainly does, and we have had some real problems as regards coming up with what we felt was a best balance within the kinds of guidelines under which we drew up our program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you mean congressional guidelines or monetary guidelines? Which do you mean?

General FRIEDMAN. I mean the guidelines handed to us for the development of the budget, and they certainly were not given to us by the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then your dollar limitations?

General FRIEDMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When has the Congress cut your R. & D. program to the degree you are hurt as compared to the limited budget you live under; where, how, and what year?

General FRIEDMAN. Congress never has to my knowledge cut our R. & D. funds. As a matter of fact, I believe in 1957 the Congress appropriated $100 million more than was requested. Last year I know there were amounts added to accelerate the missiles program, so I think the record is quite clear.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us put this thing on the record because I think that is where it belongs: Insofar as availability of funds in R. & D. in the missile field of function, the retardation of that function has never been chargeable to the Congress but the allocation of funds under your budget. Is that right or is that wrong?

General FRIEDMAN. It certainly could not be laid to the door of the Congress, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have answered the question. I do not care for any further explanation.

EFFECTIVENESS OF MINUTEMAN MISSILE

Assuming that the Soviet capability of destroying a major portion of our SAC bases, ATLAS and TITAN sites, and that is not unrealistic as an assumption so far as I am concerned, how much good will the ——— MINUTEMAN missile be against the hardened targets?

General HOLLOWAY. This depends, Mr. Chairman, primarily on the accuracy ———.

(Discussion off the record.)

General HOLLOWAY. So you can use those mathematics to figure out how many missiles you would need to get any particular.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The ratio broken down of the percentage you have expressed here would in my opinion resolve itself to about ———.

General HOLLOWAY. It depends on what degree of probability.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a ——— p.s.i.

General HOLLOWAY. It is not a straight line function.

Mr. SHEPPARD. While we are on this subject, and to me this is rather important, we have advice, and I am perfectly frank to say I think it is accurate, that the last job that was dropped in the South Pacific was not used on any other kind of a pad other than the one that they utilized on a repetitive basis. I am talking about the Russian missile in the South Pacific.

With that kind of an operation, if that is correct—and we can only assume it is correct from the information we have—on what premise are we operating on the basis of hardening all those that we have in the missile field? What is the concept involved here?

General FRIEDMAN. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the idea of—I think you are talking about hardening.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Hardened against what you call moving from A to B in order to fire off the same pad.

General FRIEDMAN. Are you referring to the mobile or to the fixed?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am talking about the last big job that they sent down in the South Pacific and told us they were going to do it. Our information is that that is a hardened pad. They utilized that one pad.

It is not submerged. It is a service pad operation. They move the missile and fire it, move another missile and fire it. We are turning ours out to the tune of over $20 million.

General FRIEDMAN. To answer your question, first of all, we are going to the fixed pad in the instance of the hardened missiles and burying them to improve survivability. It certainly makes his job all the more difficult and he must allocate many more missiles to destroy ours in a hardened condition.

As regards his firing from the same pad, I believe that that firing was not from an operational site, but from a development site.

I would assume that they are configured for requiring refiring and I believe we have this same capability ourselves at Patrick and at Vandenberg. So there you are talking about a developmental and test-type installation as opposed to an operational site which we are discussing in the instance of hardened sites.

Mr. SHEPPARD. However, there is no indication from intelligence that they are going into the hardened site operation.

General FRIEDMAN. No, sir; we unfortunately do not have as much information as we would like to have and certainly not as precise as that. Although, I believe we indicated in some previous hearings when General Power was before the commitee, that we are getting some pieces to the puzzle and getting them put together. We hope before long that we will have a better picture.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Isn't this the present condition of the operational expenditure requirements that we are operating under, and that is the conclusion that we are not willing to take the chances that they might take. We say no, we are going to bury ours. We are going to be secure. Isn't that the problem that has been resolved here?

General FRIEDMAN. We feel the only safe course is deception; that is, any course which improves the survivability of our missiles. I do not think, irrespective of what he does, that we could afford, economically or militarily, to put them out in the open where they represent a rather easy target insofar as the enemy is concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, taking the entire picture under review based upon all the intelligence that we have, we have chosen this course to be the better course to preserve and protect our ability to defend the country?

General FRIEDMAN. Yes.

General HOLLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, that is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It might be more expensive, it might be more elaborate, but that is the conclusion that has been reached, having reviewed all the potentialities we know of?

General HOLLOWAY. That is correct, sir, with particular reference to the condition under which one would assume we are going to get struck first.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

HARDENING OF LAUNCHING SITES

Mr. SIKES. What p.s.i. do we propose on our most modern launching sites?

General MINTON. We are working for ——— p.s.i. for the launching sites. We hope to get ——— p.s.i. for the launching site itself and considerably higher for the control site.

Mr. SIKES. ——— eventually?

General MINTON. We hope———

EFFECTIVENESS OF MINUTEMAN MISSILE

Mr. SIKES. How many MINUTEMEN will be required to knock out a ——— p.s.i. launching site or a ——— p.s.i. control center? We are not going to knock out any of them, with this missile, are we?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. How many missiles will be required for a target?

Colonel KENT. A rough calculation, to have 9 percent assurance, which people usually work on, would be in excess of ——— approximately ———.

Mr. SIKES. That is for one launching pad?

Colonel KENT. In excess of ——— considering reliability.

Mr. SIKES. ——— missiles to destroy one launching pad?

Colonel KENT. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. At ——— p.s.i.?

Colonel KENT. That is with ——— against the ——— p.s.i. target.

Mr. SIKES. How many would it take to knock out a control center with configuration hardened to ——— p.s.i.? There is no such thing with this missile is there?

Colonel KENT. It is off the chart.

Mr. SIKES. It is off the chart. We assume the Russians are trying to protect theirs as much as we are trying to protect ours, is that correct?

Colonel KENT. That is correct.

Mr. SIKES. Then is there any point in building this missile?

Colonel KENT. I do not think we are building them just to knock out hardened sites. In other words, if you are talking about hardened sites, we should talk about TITAN with a ——— yield, and the figures would be considerably lower. When you get to ——— p.s.i. and talk about MINUTEMAN knocking them out, there is no doubt about it, it is quite an uneconomical operation.

Mr. SIKES. Are you assuming that TITAN and ATLAS can ride out the storm if we are in fact attacked first?

Colonel KENT. I can speak to that.

If we use the NIE estimates (off the record).

Mr. SIKES. ——— would survive?

Colonel KENT. ——— sir.

Mr. SIKES. ——— would survive.

Colonel KENT. Those are round numbers.

This is across the board. You understand the first four squadrons are soft and those ——— missiles on the first four squadrons, those squadrons would essentially all be destroyed, and it is the remainder, the ones that are hard to a hundred p.s.i. that I am addressing myself to.

Mr. SIKES. What targets principally is the MINUTEMAN designed to be used against?

Colonel KENT. Well, for most targets in the Soviet Union, the great preponderance of those targets are less than ——— p.s.i.

Mr. SIKES. It is a waste of time to use it against a really hardened configuration from what you have told me. Except in cases where there are other targets, I can't see that we gain much in having this weapon.

Colonel KENT. The preponderance of targets are less than ——— p.s.i. targets. (Discussion off the record.)

The great preponderance of targets over there today are less than ——— p.s.i. targets and we can manage quite effectively against those.

Mr. SIKES. I do not want to leave the impression in the record that a ——— yield of this weapon is not powerful. It is an extremely powerful weapon so that even though this tremendous destructive force would not have a great deal of capability against a hardened configuration above ——— p.s.i., it still would have a great deal of military usefulness against other important targets?

Colonel KENT. That is correct; absolutely.

Mr. SIKES. Is it your thinking, then, that the principal use of the MINUTEMAN would never be against launching sites with hardened configurations and control centers with ——— p.s.i. or more, but it would be reserved for other uses?

Colonel KENT. I qualify my answer to this extent:

(Discussion off the record.)

Colonel KENT. Furthermore, the real sensitive thing is the CEP. If the CEP is brought down, as models improve, then it will be effective against higher p.s.i. targets. CEP makes a tremendous difference.

Mr. SIKES. You are talking about a lot of accuracy over the distances that this weapon must be fired.

Colonel KENT. Yes, sir. But there is certainly some technical progress that we will get.

Mr. SIKES. If you were to increase the yield to ——— what would that do to your ability to destroy hardened configurations successfully?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. It would still take a lot of them to do much good against that type target.

Colonel KENT. Yes. Even though it takes quite a few, you can make calculations and you find that actually it compares favorably with other type delivery systems until you get up around ——— p.s.i. and from there on it goes up. The numbers get too large.

Mr. SIKES. I should recall this, but I don't. How does the CEP compare with that of the ATLAS and TITAN?

Colonel DORFMAN. At the present time the MINUTEMAN is planned to be ——— as you have just stated. Our present planning on ATLAS is about ——— and TITAN, the initial TITANS will be in this category, the following on TITAN II should be ——— the reason being that MINUTEMAN is a later system, an all-inertial system, and we will take advantage, of course, from this development for other systems.

Colonel KENT. I might add, sir, that during the initial stages of the MINUTEMAN development, they realized that you wanted as

high yield as possible, but it was not completely obvious that you ought to build a missile to carry say ——— megatons because if you do that, for the same amount of money you can have fewer and if you have fewer, you have fewer aiming points for the Soviets to shoot at and overall you might actually have less capability than if you invested your money in the large missiles versus the small, so this was a good deal of the rationale behind MINUTEMAN then, to make a package, taking into account all factors, including the number of aiming points the Soviets had to shoot at, whereby we would have the most capability for a given investment and they came out about a —— pound missile.

Albeit, when we made these calculations, we were planning on a ——— warhead. The fact we ——— does not really affect the overall effectiveness.

Mr. SIKES. How do you program the use of these weapons, assuming that certain weapons are going to be targeted upon certain targets in the enemy area? How do you program the destruction of targets, taking into consideration the losses that you must anticipate from our own launch capability?

Colonel KENT. There really are three factors that go into the equation, and what we start with is to say, what is the probability of a missile in inventory destroying a target on the other end? Now, there are three factors that go into this: What was our survivability, what was our reliability, and what is our kill probability on the other end. I could give you an example.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. How do you arrive at the mix of weapons that you are going to launch against a particular target in order to insure a kill? If you assume that our soft configuration ATLAS missiles may be knocked out before we can use them, and that could happen, then how will you supplement the targets that they were scheduled to strike?

Colonel KENT. On that, you see that goes back to my original statement. The survivability would be low in the case of a surprise attack, where they shot at us first. In the programing of those soft ATLAS sites, we would have to program many of those to make up for assurance and when it comes right down to it, the soft missile sites, the first four ATLAS squadrons do not provide much survivability if we are attacked first.

Mr. SIKES. So you depend on other weapons for a substantial part of your kill?

Colonel KENT. That is only the beginning of the missile program. Even if they were hard, we would have to depend on the bombers for our retaliatory capability. That is not the case in the later missiles because of hardening—they will have a high degree of survivability.

Mr. SIKES. You are a good witness.

That is all.

FUNDING OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF MISSILE PROGRAMS

Mr. JONAS. I did not know that we were going into the questions and subjects to which the chairman alluded or I would have been better prepared with the questions I wish to ask.

I am drawing on my memory. If I misquote the record I will ask permission to correct it when it comes down.

General Friedman, did I understand you to say, in response to a question from the chairman, the Congress had not cut any Defense Department funds for research and development?

General FRIEDMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Over what period of time?

General FRIEDMAN. To my specific knowledge I would say that over a period of 4 years for the Department of the Air Force, it has not been reduced. However, it has been supplemented by the Congress in several instances.

Mr. JONAS. What happened in 1957 when we had a rollcall in the House in an effort to restore $131 million of funds cut by the House committee, and the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Defense made the statement, and I think I can quote him accurately? He said, "We even cut missiles a bit, but nobody is going to suffer greatly because we nicked this program about $75 million."

General FRIEDMAN. Sir, I certainly do not recall that. I do, however, recall that $375 million was under discussion in 1957, related to a requirement for dollars to build more B–52's.

I think the position of the chairman at that time, based on information given him by the Air Force, was that we could not practicably use dollars in excess of that amount to up the production rate which I think was at approximately 17 per month at that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Plus your unexpended balance.

General FRIEDMAN. That may have been part of it. This particular issue did not apply specifically to the R. & D. appropriation.

Mr. JONAS. I think if you will check the record you will find that some R. & D. funds were cut. We had a rollcall vote in the House on the effort to restore those cuts and failed to restore them. I do not think I misquoted the chairman of the subcommittee. I think I quoted him verbatim.

General FRIEDMAN. I could not respond to that, of course. Recently, on the basis of a special request, I went into the entire history of the budget amendments, supplementals, and the congressional add-ons, starting with the year 1957. I am perfectly willing to stand corrected as regards this particular item.

Mr. JONAS. There was a cut of $2.4 billion that year and $541 million came from Air Force funds.

General FRIEDMAN. I will check the circumstances on that and report back to you.

(Additional information supplied as follows:)

The first formal action to increase the Air Force budget for fiscal year 1957 was the submission to Congress by the President on April 9, 1956, of an amendment to the fiscal year 1957 budget then under consideration (H. Doc. 373). This amendment included $248.5 million to increase the rate of production of B–52's from 17 to 20 per month and increase the total number in the 1957 budget from 173 to 202 bombers. The amendment also included $60 million in military construction for B–52 bases, and $68 million for westward extension of the DEW line, for a total of $376.5 million additional for the Air Force.

The rate of B–52 production provided for in this budget amendment was the optimum rate at that time in the judgment of the Air Force in view of not only production capabilities, but also the associated problems of manpower, training, bases, etc. The futility of providing any greater sum was expressed by Representative Mahon on the floor of the House on May 11, 1956, in these words, "It

may be that amendments will be offered to increase the funds in the bill for B–52's. I shall not support such amendents. If we had 1,000 new B–52's tomorrow, we would not have the crews to maintain and man them and the airfields to operate them from."

Representative Flood did offer an amendment to provide an additional $1 billion for strategic bombers, but this was defeated by a voice vote, and the House passed the fiscal year 1957 bill with the "Aircraft and related procurement" amount as increased by the President's amendment, intact. The House also voted the full amount requested, $610 million, for research and development. The House also approved the additional military construction funds in a later bill.

On June 18, 1956 the Senate Committee on Appropriations recommended $800 million additional for aircraft and related procurement principally for heavy bombers, although the language of its report left the way open to increased fighter production as well. It also recommended $100 million additional for research and development. It further recommended an immediate appropriation of $200 million for military construction. The latter was not a true add-on, however, since it was intended that the subsequent bill for military construction be reduced by a like amount.

With respect to the funds included in the fiscal year 1957 budget amendment ($376.5 million) there was no significant delay in obtaining apportionment of funds for the programs covered by the amendment.

There was, however, considerable delay in obtaining apportionment approval of the $900 million added by Congress for heavy bombers, tankers, and R. & D. These funds were not apportioned until December 1956 in the case of the $800 million for aircraft and related procurement and January 1957 for the R. & D. funds.

Mr. JONAS. I will check it myself and put it in the record if I have permission because I think the entire record should be clear and not just part of it.

General FRIEDMAN. I believe, sir, as I recall that number, that did apply principally to the B–52's.

As regards the statement of the chairman on the floor concerning the reduction against missiles, I certainly would have no record of that and I could not comment on that aspect.

Mr. JONAS. I heard him make it and I have the record in my office and would have had it here if I had known we were going into that aspect of the situation.

However, so far as your responses to the chairman today are concerned you cannot recall any cuts?

General FRIEDMAN. I cannot, sir. I can remember adds specifically. In 1957 there was $900 million appropriated over and above the amount contained in the budget of the President, and that was appropriated.

Mr. JONAS. Congress always has the opportunity to make adds, and if it wants to increase the budget this year it has the opportunity to do so, does it not?

General FRIEDMAN. Yes, sir, it certainly does.

Mr. JONAS. So that so far as guidelines are concerned, the guidelines you follow are based somewhat on the amount of money Congress appropriates. Is that not true?

General FRIEDMAN. No, sir, not in the makeup of the budget in the sense that I was referring in response to the chairman's question.

Normally, prior to the finalization of the budget, in the last 4 years insofar as I recall, there were guidelines specified by the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of preliminary submissions.

Mr. JONAS. You are talking about guidelines for the submission of the budget?

General FRIEDMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I refer to guidelines for the program following congressional action.

General FRIEDMAN. There are now, and there always have been certain revisions in financial plans. Normally they are not formalized as guidelines.

Mr. JONAS. If Congress gives you another $100 million or $1 billion could you spend it?

General FRIEDMAN. If we were authorized to do so. However, there have been several instances where we have not.

As a specific point, I believe there were some $333 million appropriated additionally in 1958 which was not released to the Air Force. The amount was presented as a carryover, in lieu of new appropriations in the 1960 budget request.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was a matter of release of the money.

General FRIEDMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. WHITTEN. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your appearance, General. We appreciate your responses very much.

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1960.

LORAN STATIONS

WITNESSES

LT. COMDR. DANIEL C. CLEMENTS, USN, STRIKE WARFARE COORDINATION BRANCH, STRIKE WARFARE DIVISION, OFFICE OF DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (FLEET OPERATIONS AND READINESS)

CAPT. VERNE C. GIBSON, USCG, CHIEF, CIVIL ENGINEERING DIVISION, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. COAST GUARD

COMDR. N. T. PEARSON, USCG, ASSISTANT CHIEF, ELECTRONICS ENGINEERING DIVISION, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. COAST GUARD

COMDR R. I. LO FORTE, USCG, ASSISTANT CHIEF, BUDGET AND COST ANALYSIS DIVISION, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. COAST GUARD

LT. COMDR. JOHN E. MURRAY, USCG, OFFICE OF OPERATIONS, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. COAST GUARD

Program and financing

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Program by activities: Construction (object class 07)	$20,000,000	$23,200,000	$20,000,000
Financing: Appropriation (new obligational authority)	20,000,000	23,200,000	20,000,000

Mr. SHEPPARD. The next item has to do with the loran stations. I understand you have a general statement for presentation purposes.

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may present it.

Commander CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I am Lt. Comdr. Daniel C. Clements from the Strike Warfare Division of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the appropriation "Loran stations, Department of Defense," provides funds which are advanced to the Coast Guard for the construction of loran stations in accordance with defense requirements approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Loran (long-range navigation) is a network of widely separated ground station transmitters which provides continuous information to ships and aircraft operating within receiver distance. Loran works day and night in all kinds of weather and permits safe and effective operations of ships and aircraft which can fix their navigational position throughout large areas very quickly by means of intersecting loran lines of position. Loran is a passive system which permits a user to determine his position without transmitting any energy.

Growth of the loran system since World War II has resulted in the development of three subsidiary systems now designated loran–A, loran–B, and loran–C. Loran–A was formerly known as standard loran. Loran–B, under development by the Navy and Coast Guard for several years, is a short-range, precision, navigation system which will undergo a series of evaluation tests within the next 12 months. Loran–C, which provides greater coverage and accuracy, is being installed in areas where loran–A is not adequate. All three loran systems are based on the principle of measuring differences between times of receipt of pulses transmitted from pairs of stations. Properly modified loran receivers can receive and measure signals from more than one type of loran system.

The necessity for loran coverage rests primarily on the fact that units of the military forces of the United States must be prepared to operate on the sea, under the sea, and in the air wherever and whenever their presence may be required. In order to carry out these operations most effectively and efficiently, it is essential that our ships and aircraft know their precise navigational position at all times. Therefore, we must supplement celestial navigation with a continuous, accurate, and reliable means of all-weather navigation. The loran system has proven to be the only long-distance navigational system in operation today which will provide our military forces with this service. Loran–A has been accepted by the NATO organization as a standard long-distance navigation system for its armed forces. Loran–A is used extensively by commercial shipping, private yachtsmen, fishermen, and commercial airlines.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1961 includes a request for $20 million for construction of loran stations. This amount should be reduced to $19 million. These funds will permit the Coast Guard to construct the loran stations and associated facilities necessary to provide the remaining coverage required by the current loran plan, approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on December 31, 1957.

With me today to assist in answering detailed questions are Captain Gibson, Commander Pearson, Commander LoForte and Lieutenant Commander Murray, U.S. Coast Guard.

Thank you gentlemen.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From your statement, I can only assume that the original loran stations were not equipped to handle the modernized concept that you are presently requesting, is that correct?

Commander CLEMENTS. No, sir. This is merely an extension or expansion of the system which already exists. Some of it is 15 years old.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The definition of A and B does not mean anything, then, insofar as escalation of operation is concerned, but it does mean an extension of the already existing loran system.

Commander CLEMENTS. The loran–B is a newer, separate type. It is for precision navigation beyond the capability of either the loran–A or loran–C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you going to replace the original loran and loran–B with the modern type, or where will it be incorporated in the system?

Commander CLEMENTS. The Loran–A was developed during World War II. The principle of operation of Loran–A, Loran–B, and Loran–C is all the same. However, the technique which you employ and the frequency at which you transmit your signals vary the capability of the system. If you transmit on the normal Loran–A frequencies of approximately 2000 kilocycles and do not employ phase matching of the received signals, the degree of accuracy you get as the user is limited. If you go down in frequency, as we do in Loran–C, to 100 kilocycles, 20 times lower, your signals are propagated to a much greater distance. If you use special techniques of cycle matching or phase matching, then you can determine this time difference to a much more accurate degree. Therefore, the accuracy and the range are increased.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does it mean that you are going to substitute for the existing Lorans the new devices as such because of their ability as compared with the inability of the original? Or are you just going to fit them in?

Commander CLEMENTS. We are using Loran–C primarily where Loran–A will not fill the military requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are you still using Loran–A?

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir, we are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, it is the intention to use all of these Loran operations, but to escalate them by efficiency of operation in certain geographical areas, as I interpret the presentation.

Commander CLEMENTS. That is correct.

STATUS OF LORAN PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the total program for these stations?

Commander CLEMENTS. The total program under the current plan is approximately $77 million. This is the last request for the current plan, sir—$19 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as you know, will this appropriation, if granted, suffice for the total efficient operation of the Loran system?

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir, as the plan is currently approved, it will.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have the necessary base rights to proceed with the stations?

Commander CLEMENTS. May I defer to Commander Murray of the Coast Guard, who is in that business, sir?

Commander MURRAY. Of the Loran–C stations, we do have the base rights. Four are going in this year. We do have all the base rights. Of the Loran–A stations, we have four of the base rights, and the other six are in progress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it contemplated you will have them in the reasonably near future, or not?

Commander MURRAY. Three we feel confident we will have in the reasonably near future.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are the base rights in this instance being handled by the State Department? or by the Navy? or by both?

Commander MURRAY. By the State Department.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You would not be overly optimistic on the time element, would you?

Commander MURRAY. I have no time element. I do not know the time element. We defer that to the State Department. They tell us the progress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am assuming that, insofar as the past is concerned, you have all the base rights for the original Loran stations, and no problem exists there now as compared to what might have existed in the beginning?

Commander CLEMENTS. As far as installations on foreign soil are concerned, there is a general desire by many nations to operate all such stations on their soil.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the proposed location of the six sites you stated were not obtained?

Commander MURRAY. Three are in the Caribbean area and three are in South America.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How much long leadtime procurement is required for the mechanical devices which will go into the modern concept that you are asking to be funded?

Commander CLEMENTS. With your permission, I will refer to Commander Pearson, who is the Assistant Chief of the Electronics Division, to discuss that.

Commander PEARSON. Roughly 16 to 18 months after we have let the contract, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the most recent conference you have had with the State Department relative to the easements you are asking for in that area?

Commander PEARSON. I would have to defer to either Commander Clements or Commander Murray. I could not say.

Commander CLEMENTS. Could we discuss this off the record, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes. I am trying to establish the leadtime involved here on the properties in order that you may expend the funds which you request for this year's budget.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am wondering if you would confer with the State Department and get an estimate from them as to when they think they can consummate the requirements for land operations for the purpose of the installations you are presently asking to be funded.

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir; we can.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will you do that and either present the letter to the committee, if you wish to, or insert it in the record. I presume it is classified and that you would prefer to present it to the committee.

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You may advise the State Department that it will be kept in that category and that it will not become a part of the record.

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That ought to obviate any reluctance that might exist in the Department.

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does this request involve all three types?

Commander CLEMENTS. There are no funds being requested at this time for loran–B, sir. It is still under development. We merely mentioned it so there would be no confusion of what happended to B when we went from A to C.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So it is confined to A and C?

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on the item?

Mr. JONAS. Only one question. You have 10 stations already in being.

Commander PEARSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Eight under construction.

Commander CLEMENTS. Actually, sir, there are some 60-odd loran–A stations in operation throughout the world.

Mr. JONAS. I am reading from page 4 of the justification, the last paragraph:

> Ten of the stations have already been completed; 8 are being constructed this fiscal year; and 14 are programed for construction in fiscal year 1961—to make a total of 32.

Commander CLEMENTS. Yes, sir; that is correct. That is under this last loran plan, sir, which was approved in 1957. Prior to that time there were some stations already constructed.

Mr. JONAS. I ask this question, and if you do not want your answer on the record, we will take the question and answer off. Do you have any locations which are now in jeopardy for any reason or other?

Commander CLEMENTS. Not that we know of, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You are not having any trouble regarding land use for any of the existing stations?

Commander CLEMENTS. Off the record, sir.

(Off the record.)

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, gentlemen.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1960.

PROPERTIES AND INSTALLATIONS

WITNESSES

HON. FLOYD S. BRYANT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
ALLEN FORE, CHIEF, PROJECTS DIVISION, DIRECTOR OF CONSTRUCTION
MAX BARTH, CHIEF, TECHNICAL DIVISION, DIRECTOR OF CONSTRUCTION
ROBERT WHITTET, SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR EXCESS PROPERTY, DIRECTOR OF REAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
M. A. NORTON, CHIEF, REAL ESTATE DIVISION, DIRECTOR OF REAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have with us this morning the Honorable Floyd S. Bryant, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations.

Do you have a prepared statement you wish to present to the committee, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. BRYANT. I do, sir, and it is reasonably short.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed, and we will not interrupt you until you have completed it.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (PROPERTIES AND INSTALLATIONS)

Mr. BRYANT. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before you on behalf of the Department of Defense in connection with the military construction appropriation for fiscal year 1961.

Before proceeding with a discussion of this appropriation, I should like to thank your committee for its prompt approval of the expansion of our ATLAS program which was initiated earlier this year. This has permitted construction arrangements for these important facilities to get underway, so that when can take better advantage of this year's working season. We feel that this expansion, plus the recent adjustments in our air defense and ballistic missile programs, will provide significant improvements in our military capabilities.

Your recent review of the individual appropriation requests of the three Departments has already provided you with considerable detail concerning the specific projects proposed for the coming year. Accordingly, I will limit my remarks to the overall aspects of the program, with particular emphasis to matters in which your committee has expressed interest in prior years.

The projects for military construction in support of the Active Forces in this budget total $1,165 million, of which $287 million represents projects authorized in prior years but not yet started, and the balance, $878 million, represents projects for which new authorization has been requested in our fiscal year 1961 authorization bill. As the latter amount constitutes the major portion of this appropriation, I should like to outline briefly the manner in which the facilities com-

prising the fiscal year 1961 authorization were planned, reviewed, and finally selected, after repeated screening, as the projects necessary to support our most urgent operational requirements.

DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1961 CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR THE ACTIVE FORCES

After their initial planning and preparation at the respective Army, Navy, and Air Force bases, the projects comprising the fiscal year 1961 military construction authorization program were consolidated and screened by the various intermediate commands within each Department. Following this, these projects were again reviewed at the headquarters of the three respective Departments, before transmittal to the Secretary of Defense.

During the examination of this program in my office, and in the other offices of the Secretary of Defense, particular care was taken to verify that those projects selected for inclusion in this bill were needed to support long-term future objectives, military plans, and force levels. However, despite the considerable care which is exercised in this forward planning, instances may occur, such as the recent decision to stop further construction at Bong Air Force Base, when rapid new weapons developments or unforeseen changes in forces will require revisions in our construction planning, and the closing of installations. I feel confident that the Congress will support us where such changes are justified. We shall continue to carefully phase and correlate base construction with weapons procurement and operational requirements, and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that serious effort is being made throughout the Defense Establishment on this important aspect of our planning.

We are well aware that heavy expenditures for new weapons will create a tremendous financial burden for the next several years. For this reason, the items requested in this bill have been strictly limited to those for which a compelling military necessity exists. Projects which were merely desirable, but not essential, have been eliminated. Moreover, those projects which were approved for inclusion in this bill were each scrutinized from the standpoint of size, cost, location, and proper design.

Other objectives of our review are: to close and dispose of installations, either in whole or in part, wherever practicable; to effect maximum utilization of our permanent major installations in order to conserve manpower and operating costs; to limit the acquisition of new real estate to the absolute minimum; and to utilize existing Government-owned land wherever possible to meet new requirements.

Major emphasis has been given, as in past years, to utilizing existing facilities to the maximum extent in lieu of new construction or land acquisition, and all projects in this legislation have been screened by my office against existing inactive and excess installations. As you know, Mr. Chairman, an inventory has been developed in order to improve this screening operation, and to provide assistance to the military departments in their screening activities. This inventory, a copy of which has been furnished this committee, is now being cross-indexed to improve its usefulness, following which it will be distributed

to the military departments for use in deevloping their fiscal year 1962 military construction programs.

After completion of our examination of the program, all questionable projects that had been encountered were discussed in detail with the respective departmental representatives, and this year, as a result of our review and screening procedures, the programs submitted by the three military departments in support of their Active Forces were reduced from their original total of $1,513 million to an approved total of $982 million. Then, the Bureau of the Budget conducted a still further review, during which the program was reduced to $972 million, which was the amount of new authorization requested in the fiscal year 1961 authorization bill.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that in making these reductions in the original program requests, many prudent economies have been achieved, without causing any impairment to our military capabilities. Great care has been exercised in this respect, and the final decisions reached on the program content reflect the combined judgment of the numerous offices within the Department of Defense and the military departments which participate in this review.

Congressional action on this authorization bill is not yet complete. However, in order that action could be started by your committee on our fiscal year 1961 appropriation request, projects were selected from the bill which should be placed under construction during fiscal year 1961, and it is these items, totaling $878 million, which comprise the new authorization portion of our funding programs.

The remaining projects in these funding programs, which total $287 million, consist principally of items selected from prior years' authorization on which construction has been delayed. Due to their postponement, the need for certain of these prior years' projects has new become more urgent. Careful study has been devoted to the division of fiscal year 1961 funds so as to assure continued progress on both prior authorization, and on new projects that must be provided to support the new weapons and advanced technology of our military forces.

FUNDING PROGRAM FOR RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Our funding programs for Reserve Forces facilities consist of projects totaling $37 million for which authorization has been requested in our fiscal year 1961 authorization bill, plus projects totaling $2 million which were authorized in previous authorization acts. These facilities are outlined in the funding program on an individual line-item basis, and have been subjected to the same type essentiality review as the projects which comprise our three larger funding programs for the Active Forces. Details on these programs have already been provided your committee by departmental witnesses.

MEASURES BEING TAKEN TO IMPROVE PLANNING, TO OBTAIN BETTER CONSTRUCTION, AND TO REDUCE COSTS

Continued progress has been made in the establishment of economical and uniform quality for military construction. This has been accomplished by the issuance of Department of Defense instructions which prescribe standards and criteria for most of the principal repetitive-

type facilities common to the three military departments. These instructions, while establishing quality standards and space criteria, provide a measure of flexibility for the varying requirements of the services.

Surveillance of our construction standards and criteria has been maintained through site inspections of numerous types of facilities. An example of such surveillance is the technical inspection and analysis of representative Capehart housing projects to determine the adequacy and economy of the projects being constructed to date, which has resulted in appropriate revisions and improvement in the Department of Defense standards for these facilities.

Economies are also being attained within all the Departments by more repetitive use of previously proven designs, which reduces engineering costs, and greatly aids in eliminating change orders. There is always room for improvement in this field, and we shall certainly continue our efforts in order that additional savings may be achieved.

Special attention has been directed toward the design of hospitals so as to attain all practicable cost reductions, yet provide an efficient and useful structure. I am confident that added economies will result from this action. In addition to this, a procedure has been established whereby careful consideration by a technically qualified staff is given to existing hospital capacity, both civil and Government, in the area of a proposed new military hospital, prior to approving such projects.

Particular attention is devoted to proposals for new structures or expansions of existing facilities to house activities which can be economically performed by commercial enterprise rather than by military forces. A rigid justification requirement for projects of this type has been established, and such proposals are carefully reviewed not only by my office, but by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics.

We are continuing to perform the maximum practicable amount of our construction by means of formally advertised contracts. Except under unusual circumstances, all contracts are being awarded on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, and during fiscal year 1959, 92 percent of all work placed under contract was handled in this manner. Every effort will be made to continue our practice of advertising for bids on the open market. Placement of contracts by negotiation will be utilized only where such procurement is required due to unusual circumstances, and is in the best interests of the Government.

In view of the changes and improvements which are rapidly occurring in the present cycle of weapons development, many facilities, particularly those of a special nature which are needed to support a particular weapon, may have a high rate of obsolescence. This will be most critical for missile systems which are expected to be replaced by later followon models that will require entirely different types of launch and support facilities.

For this reason we are endeavoring to design these transition-type facilities so as to provide quality and durability consistent with their special requirement and their relatively short period of use. We are also seeking similar economies for other short-term use facilities, such as structures in support of aircraft which have only a short period of use remaining before their phase out.

Special attention is being given to assure that existing structures are utilized to the full extent of their usable life. New or replacement structures have been requested only when available facilities cannot be utilized, either in their present form, or with economical modifications. Wherever possible, we are trying to adapt existing structures to meet our needs, so as to minimize new construction and make the best possible use of facilities now on hand.

Where new facilities must be provided due to special requirements, or to replace structures that can no longer be economically maintained, we are requiring that compatible functions be combined into single buildings, in order to attain savings on utilities, circulation space, and other repetitive items. Consideration is also being given to prefabricated buildings, in view of their ready availability and low cost.

Buildings which can be economically continued in use despite the fact that they do not conform in some respects to modern design principles are continuing to be used wherever practicable. We recognize, Mr. Chairman, that men, money, and materials are at a premium, and we are doing our utmost to make the most effective use of our financial and material resources.

New land acquisitions have been kept to a minimum through the application of conservative criteria to land requirements and the maximum use of existing holdings. The estimated cost of the land or interest therein for which authorization is requested this year in fulfillment of military requirements is substantially less than the total expenditure for such purposes for any fiscal year since fiscal year 1950, notwithstanding the requirements for missile sites.

My office conducts a continuous review of all military real property holdings so as to enable the military departments to make maximum, efficient, and economical use of existing facilities and to identify property which can be excessed and disposed of, thereby conserving manpower and operating costs. The effectiveness of such review involves close liaison and coordination with the three military departments in order to assure that the essential military base structure is provided within the framework of this economical concept. Methods for improving the technique of this review are constantly under study by my staff.

During the period March 1, 1959, to April 15, 1960, 124 entire installations and portions of 64 other installations were identified and excessed or are in the process of being excessed. The installations so identified represent 2,216,042 acres of land which, with improvements, cost $740,830,000.

Substantial economies have also been effected through joint utilization of land and facilities as between the services, particularly in the functional areas of logistical support, as well as the consolidation of activities into fewer facilities, and transfers of facilities between the military departments. For example, a recent survey of military real properties in the State of Hawaii, conducted under the supervision of my office, disclosed over 3,000 acres of land in 92 separate areas as excess to the requirements of the cognizant military department and that at least 35 separate facilities were used jointly by two or more services. Copies of this survey report have been furnished this committee. We are continuing this study in order to assure that all land to be retained in Hawaii is definitely required to support firm long-

term requirements and have requested the military departments to consider methods to enable the disposition of additional acreage at various designated locations on the Islands of Oahu and Kauai.

Our records show that during the period from fiscal year 1955 to March 1, 1960, a total of 272,939 acres with improvements, having an original cost of approximately $353 million, has been transferred between the military departments. In addition, land is frequently permitted by one military department to another, and there are many installations where joint operations are conducted, such as the three national missile ranges. We fully share the views of this committee concerning the substantial savings in annual operating expenditures which can be achieved by making the most efficient possible use of the installations now under military control, and we are endeavoring to improve property management activities in order to increase such savings.

With respect to military family housing, we are giving constant attention to both the procurement of new housing by the military departments and the economical utilization of the more than 300,000 units currently in our inventory. Criteria for the fulfillment of housing requirements, established by my office nearly 3 years ago, continue to apply satisfactorily despite unanticipated changes in misisons and deployments resulting from advancing military concepts. As we approach substantial satisfaction of our more pressing housing needs, we are proceeding with increasing caution in the approval of new projects. Maximum reliance is placed upon the private housing supply in the communities.

Field requests for Capehart housing are carefully scrutinized by my staff in order to insure compliance with requirements criteria and the latest long-range troop strengths and deployments. Priority is given to the more urgently needed projects and large projects are normally broken down into two or more increments. Before final construction clearance is issued, each new project is reexamined at least twice after initial approval and authorization so as to insure that a firm long-range requirement continues to exist. In the Capehart program alone over 19,000 authorized units have been deferred or eliminated from the program as a result of this type review.

Standards and criteria for the construction of family housing have been developed and issued to assure that the Department of Defense obtains suitable housing at the lowest practicable cost. In some instances, the use of so-called standard plans, or site adapting the designs for one project to one or more other projects, is helpful in achieving this purpose. Where climatic and site factors are similar, such site adapting does effect economies, and instructions have been issued to the military departments to give careful consideration to this approach wherever warranted. Extensive use will be made of site-adapted plans by the three military departments in the fiscal year 1961 housing programs.

Substantial strides have been made in obtaining uniformity among the services with respect to Wherry acquisitions. Appraisals are required for all acquisitions of Wherry projects to determine the fair market value of the property. Further, the services have been informed of our position with respect to continuing negotiations wherever possible before resorting to condemnation action. Finally spe-

cific clearance from my office is required before a declaration of taking is filed for the condemnation of a Wherry project.

We are maintaining continuous surveillance over the trend of court awards for Wherry projects. Although awards have been made during the past year for projects—control over which was obtained by the services several years ago—and these awards, in many cases, exceed the amount of the sponsor's lowest offer or the formula price, we do not believe that they are sufficient in number to provide a basis for revising our procedures at this time. Many of these awards have been appealed and are not yet final. I have been pleased to note, however, that with respect to several projects approved for acquisition during the past year, it has been possible to negotiate an agreement with the sponsor at a fair and reasonable price.

In order to attain more effective control of the scope and cost of projects for the renovation of Wherry housing, an instruction has been issued which specifically defines the items of renovation and improvement which are permissible when necessary and establishes a guide for adequate floor areas, indicates standards of construction to be achieved, prescribes cost limitations, and provides for a careful and detailed technical review of the proposed work before approval. After this review, the project is revised as necessary before funds are requested. We find that this procedure has been effective, and our field inspections reveal that we are attaining very satisfactory results at reasonable costs. As a result, our survey of funded Wherry rehabilitation projects as of January 1960 reveals that the average unit cost for 39,116 units is $2,366 per unit, which is well below the $3,000 limitation.

We have established a comprehensive reporting system for maintenance costs in a more detailed and usable form than previously available. This new system will improve our surveillance of maintenance costs. Criteria and standards have also been prescribed for the maintenance and operation of military family housing, and we intend to increase our efforts to reduce costs in this area. Steps which are now underway in this field include a survey and evaluation of management techniques and procedures for the operation and maintenance of family housing and the costs thereof. This study will provide the basis for further actions to obtain optimum economies and effectiveness in the management and costs of maintenance and operation of military family housing.

Beginning this year, direct appropriations (classed as "currency restricted" appropriations) will be utilized to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign currencies at the time they are used for construction overseas. This will provide a closer overall control of the utilization of foreign currencies. With respect to new projects, use will not be made of reimbursement from quarters allowances withheld from occupants of housing built from surplus commodity funds.

With regard to the Surplus Commodity "barter" program in France, we have taken all reasonable steps to insure that the net income will be sufficient to repay the Department of Defense obligation to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Arrangements have been made for the return to CCC of $646,956 not required for construction of the 2,403 housing units and we expect that a further $100,000 or more will similarly be available to reduce the $50 million program ceiling. In addition, we have stipulated that the management, maintenance, and oper-

ating costs (which are deducted from the forfeited quarters allowances available for repayment) shall not exceed an average of $65 per unit per month. Army and Air Force have been instructed to make every effort to keep actual expenditures below this ceiling in an attempt to achieve complete reimbursement to the CCC within the 20-year prepaid lease term.

Steps have likewise been taken to assure attainment of maximum utilization of our growing inventory of Government-controlled housing assets. The military departments are required to report to my office periodically with respect to the occupancy of all such quarters worldwide, and appropriate attention will be given to any installation where the vacancies exceed 5 percent.

With specific reference to the Reserve Forces facilities programs, comprehensive policy guidance for determination and implementation of requirements for such facilities was completely reviewed and substantially revised during 1959. The most significant change was the adpotion of drill-pay strengths as a basis for measuring facilities requirements, replacing "authorized" strengths which related to Ready Reserve strength goals.

Each of the Reserve components now maintains complete stationing plans or facilities schedules for all of its organizational elements based on current drill-pay strength quotas, and these furnish a ready means for analysis and evaluation of facilities programs and projects.

Quantitative allowances for the many types of facilities required by the various Reserve components are selectively reevaluated to maintain realistic standards in consonance with current Reserve Forces structure and missions. As examples, criteria for nonarmory types of facilities for the Army National Guard were restudied and brought up to date during the last year, and guard armory space criteria now are in process of comprehensive review to make them more responsive to the changed organizational pattern and to assure that expenditures of appropriations for armories are related to a reasonable military necessity.

Considerable effort has gone into that facet of our program review which seeks to identify joint utilization potential. By far the majority of armory-type facilities are in (1) the smaller communities where only a single Reserve component is established and no requirement nor opportunity for joint utilization is present; and (2) the major cities and towns where the larger facilities are required which rarely can be jointly utilized by a second Reserve component, since scheduled drill-period use of an armory-type facility beyond four nights a week generally is impracticable except on a temporary basis. Also, facilities for the Reserve aviation units, which are designed for training in the operation and maintenance of aircraft, are so specialized that they are not suitable normally for joint use by nonaviation units. However, these facilities are utilized on a full workweek schedule by the permanent party personnel in actual maintenance of the aircraft and other equipment.

Thus, the area of real possibility for joint facilities is narrowed to a smuch smaller segment of our program than would at first thought seem to be the case. However, of the nearly 2,000 armory-type facilities constructed or programed for the Reserve components, approximately 400 have joint users or were approved subject to pro-

vision for future expansion for joint use by another component. Of the 140-odd armory-type projects for which authorization has been requested for fiscal year 1961, 26 involve joint use. These figures do not include, of course, the numerous aviation facilities where there is joint use of at least the runway and taxiway systems; nor do they include numerous armory-type facilities acquired other than by construction at which there is joint utilization by local arrangements between commanders of Reserve units. I can assure you that my staff gives great attention to the promotion of joint use where it will achieve appreciable economies.

Mr. Chairman, I have briefly outlined some of the many management measures which are being taken by my office to insure that the essential installation support for the armed services is provided, maintained, and utilized economically and efficiently and in a manner consistent with the best interests of the Government. I appreciate your patience and courtesy in receiving this rather lengthy statement. I am pleased to meet with you here, and it is my wish to provide this committee with any information it desires in connection with its consideration of this legislation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for a fine presentation.

POSSIBLE CHANGES IN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

There are several items in your general statement which call to mind particular areas of interest to the committee. I would like to discuss them with you at this time. On page 3, you spoke of the problem of unforeseen changes and forces causing curtailment of construction. At the present time do you know of any changes proposed or contemplated, or which might be in the offing, in any of the services which would reflect a change either in the fiscal year 1961 program now before this committee or in items under construction at the present time or which we have funded in the past?

Mr. BRYANT. I know of none at this time, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say in that connection, however, that as of the latter part of last week and on yesterday I was apprised of the possibility that the Navy Department might want to seek some changes in connection with the line items which have been quite recently proposed before you in connection with, and this is not certain, additional costs which appear to be involved in the continuance of the big dish.

I was to tell you this morning this was being carefully and intensively reviewed, because I was present at a meeting last Friday and on Monday with Mr. Bantz. Mr. Bantz intends to see you personally about this. Unfortunately final details on these possible changes have not yet been settled, so I cannot yet discuss them personally.

I do not think it will be a serious thing but since it falls within the question you asked me I felt I should tell you about it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In this area, what has been done with the question of the construction of facilities on Johnston Island in connection with the NIKE-ZEUS tests?

Mr. BRYANT. There has been no construction at Johnston Island as of yet. This is because of a review which was requested by Dr. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

He wants to look further into the practicability and perhaps improvement from the standpoint of the testing for NIKE-ZEUS, the

practicability of utilizing the practice shots from Vandenberg of the ICBM type.

This is also coupled with the fact that, as you know, the IRBM program has been pretty largely finished so far as research and development work is concerned and it is being deployed. The question of whether or not we should use a considerable number of IRBM's at Johnston Island which might be accommodated by the required R. & D. shots of the ICBM from Vandenberg is up for further study.

We are assured, and I have no reason to doubt this as a result of our own review, that this will not delay the accomplishment of the objective originally intended for R. & D. work on the NIKE-ZEUS, for this reason:

All of the installation work with respect to the project for the launching site for the NIKE-ZEUS is going forward on time. The provision for launching the ICBM's can be phased into the completion of Kwajalein.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is there any indication at all as to when Dr. York will make up his mind on this problem, whether it is to be made up prior to the marking up of this bill or thereafter?

Mr. BRYANT. May I answer to that this afternoon?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

ELIMINATION OF NONESSENTIAL PROJECTS

You state that projects which were merely desirable but not essential have been eliminated. What consideration did you give to the projects which were submitted principally for the Air Force program after the original budget submission had been made to the Congress?

Mr. BYRANT. Do you include expansion of the ATLAS program?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. BRYANT. And also the companion program. That decision came about over a period of time, of course, in the process of making a decision. It came about at a time when the bill had been proposed and had been forwarded here.

This was because the Air Force, with the ultimate endorsement of the Department of Defense, felt that the phasing forward of the ICBM was now a preferable means of supporting our retaliatory effort and our security, vis-a-vis, the program of mixed manned bombers and ICBM on the old order.

I think that was the most serious. Perhaps I have overlooked something else you had in mind.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My question was directed to the effect that they had come in regarding the principal budget. I wondered whether or not they had been screened on the same basis as the others had.

Mr. BRYANT. I would say it is undoubtedly a fact that the reconsideration of the phasing of the missile advance had been going on for some time but had not jelled until that rather late date. It would have been preferable, of course, had a decision been reached before the bill was sent forward.

However, I know the study extended back into the fall of last year, beginning with the fall of last year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are many changes going on in that field. Perhaps this received proportionate consideration at an earlier stage, perhaps there were budget reasons for recent drops. There may have

been a question of whether you had ample time to scrutinize those on the same basis as other budget items.

You also state that these projects have been closely scrutinized from the standpoint of size, cost, location, and proper design. I would like to ask you how items such as $25,000 per unit for prefabricated houses which we already own and schedule for erection in Turkey occur.

Mr. BRYANT. That is a big price for a prefab in Turkey, Mr. Chairman. These houses, I think you probably know, originally were intended to have been erected in Morocco. The situation there deteriorated.

We had houses which were generated under surplus commodity credits. The fact they could be used and the fact they should be used was paramount. We didn't want to lose them.

Even though on site, including the original purchase price, they come to the price you mention, this is the result of the cost of transportation, the fact that some of the utility leads and other connections were lost at the original site before that was stopped and had to be repurchased, and we had to find a site and erect them and adapt the buildings to the site.

I maintain this: the need was there. What was the cheapest way to do it? I am of the firm opinion that starting from scratch we could not have bettered the ultimate price that these houses cost erected.

After all, there is another element there which I think we ought to consider. These are presently estimates, at least so far as construction is concerned. Bids are now pending. We do not have a firm bid as yet. These are the best estimates of the Corps of Engineers as to what construction and erection costs will be.

Also some of the utility work is included in this cost.

I have a breakdown, Mr. Chairman. I believe it was perhaps furnished by the Air Force. If not I can submit a breakdown for the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are going to furnish one. This price on the face of it looks exorbitant. You have tremendous variables involved here and $25,000 per unit looks very exorbitant.

Even though they lost something due to the transportation and utilities, this is prefab work, this prefab organization is still in business, and it is not a question of going into a nonstandardized requirement. In other words, you can separate one from the other if you wanted to. Let us assume you had 20,000 units in toto——

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This figure looks very unsatisfactory.

Mr. BRYANT. We could not find any ammunition to criticize the estimate. I am not so sure now that there are now units available for replacement of these items which were in place in Morocco before the project was stopped.

UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now with reference to the maximum utilization of facilities, the hearings before the committee have brought out the problem of a transfer of information between the services with ref-

erence to the closing of military facilities. The problem exists not after these facilities have been reported to the public and Congress as being ready for inactivation, but during the formative stages. What steps does your office take to see that the services are aware of each other's thinking with reference to the closure or curtailment of activities?

Mr. BRYANT. As you know, we completed an inventory and then built a cross-index service to go with it, which I believe has been furnished to the committee. That is now in the process of being duplicated in numbers and sent to the services.

It is true that the services did not have this particular bit of machinery at the time of the creation of the fiscal year 1961 program, but we were getting it all the time as we were accomplishing this index.

We had the advantage in our office of checking against the service requirements which had been accumulating in our office.

Since that time, with the cross-index service we created here, we have gone back over those items involving what might have been a new construction which could have been provided elsewhere to recheck our work. We have found, much to my satisfaction, Mr. Chairman, no instances in which the failure of the services last year to have this distributed to them individually has caused any duplication.

I think your purpose and my purpose will be eminently better served next year, and we intend to go further in this, Mr. Chairman. It is a matter of considerable work and certainly a matter of determining the best management tool.

I want to find out, and we are making steps to find out, what are, in a given installation, excess facilities which might perhaps better be used not only within that organization or that Department but possibly available for other departmental uses.

This is a step further than the deactivation of an installation per se. The identification should be accomplished not only with greater certainty with respect to the screening out of unnecessary new construction but it may also in the ultimate, in my opinion, be used to determine what individual installations might be withdrawn by an improvement of an existing one which was only partially or incompletely utilized.

This, I think, is a major enterprise. I am not sure just exactly how it should be set up. We are giving this considerable study at the present time. It is a forward step beyond what I am talking about in this index.

The index now is not only geographical but with respect to types of facilities.

Mr. SIKES. In what instances, Mr. Secretary, have bases which are surplus to one service been accepted and used by another service?

Mr. BRYANT. One which comes to mind, Mr. Sikes, is the Parks Air Force Base and the adjoining base, I have forgotten the name of it, in California below San Francisco. One was excessed by the Air Force and the Army picked it up. We were able to dispose of certain installations surrounded by the city of Pittsburg, Calif. It could not be expanded and it was a costly area. That is one that comes to mind.

Mr. SIKES. Are there others?

Mr. BRYANT. I do not have a list with me. As a matter of fact, the demands of services for new areas and new installation requirements has been so modest this year as compared with last year—for example, I reported last year a list which I do not have now—that we have not generated the same sort of need between one service and another.

However, in better answer to your question, I will attempt to provide for the record anything else beyond that which comes to my mind.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have the record show any facilities which have been used by another service after being declared surplus by one service during the last 5 years.

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

(The information requested will be found beginning on p. 736.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will that cause a delay in getting your report back up to this Congress?

Mr. BRYANT. No, sir. I think I can do that within a 24-hour period.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want it expressly understood that I want these reports finished down there immediately. We do not have much time. We have a deadline to meet and in turn we will ask you people to conform with these requirements as rapidly as you can.

Mr. BRYANT. I will assure you of that, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you. As always, you are cooperative and we appreciate it. Again referring to the liaison, for example, when did you learn of the proposal of the Air Force to close the various bases which they presented to the Congress and the other services last Friday?

Mr. BRYANT. As a matter of fact, officially we have not heard about it at all. You mean with respect to the contract flying schools?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. BRYANT. Only one which has been officially reported and cleared out of six. Five pending have not been forwarded for scrutiny. We have a provision to assure that they shall be before they are publicized.

I direct your attention in that regard to a directive issued by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, on February 2, 1960, No. 5410.10. That directive covered this particular issue.

This has to do not only with the deactivation of installations but also with reductions in force, whether under contract arrangement or otherwise.

The machinery in this is that when these are determined by a given service they are to be reported to legislative liaison and to all interested agencies of the OSD, such as S. & L. and P. & I., for review.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can understand their being reported to the Liaison Office for publicity purposes but I cannot understand the lack of cooperation and perhaps premature release to your office because of the influence it might have on your review for budget reasons. Anytime there is a hiatus in between the time you learn of it and the publicity, it does not help.

Mr. BRYANT. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You should have an opportunity to perhaps revise some of your concepts and presentations which already have been formulated based on facts you had at the time you made your original decision.

Mr. BRYANT. The directive will answer the question, I believe. This states the procedures to assure that appropriate officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense will be apprised of the planned action in advance. This is where we have our opportunity, along with other interested agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, either to find a new use, propose a new use or secondary use, to screen the services, and do all that is necessary to insure that the action recommended must and shall be taken in that form.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask a question?

Do I understand you to say that there is a regulation which specifies that your office will be advised of these matters before they are released to the general public?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. In this particular instance the information was released to the public last Friday, so apparently the regulation is observed more by omission than commission.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the date of that regulation?

Mr. BRYANT. February 2, 1960.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If that regulation was issued in February, in view of the operation to which my colleague and I have referred, the regulation apparently is not working so far.

Mr. BRYANT. I do not know what has been publicized, if at all. I do not know under what circumstances the advance information was made available to the committee. Is that what you are speaking about, Mr. Sikes?

Mr. SIKES. Members of Congress who are affected, presumably the committees which are affected, and the general public were all apprised at 1 o'clock last Friday.

(Off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee had occasion during the last year, for example, to call to the attention of the Navy that the Air Force was contemplating the closure of a base in an area where the Navy planned to construct a new reserve armory facility. The committee had received this information in an official manner, but found that the Navy knew nothing about it, either on the local or on the Washington level. What, in your opinion, can be done to eliminate that kind of situation because, obviously, here again there is a lack of interrelationships between the departments when it comes to evaluating what can be used of that which is available or what cannot be used because of its impracticability, operational or otherwise?

Mr. BRYANT. The fact remains that the primary responsibility is in our office with our knowledge of the present or pending availability of a nearby facility which was going to be inactivated. We take into consideration the use of that site for the new project. As I said, we are now trying to help that situation by having the services cognizant of what is available. I doubt that we are in a position, except by issuance of instructions from time to time, or information, to apprise them of pending consideration of closings by a sister agency, but this we will endeavor to do. As far as we are concerned, when we know of such a situation we take that into consideration in passing upon the new project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been brought to your attention regarding the proposal of the Air Force to inactivate Ethan Allen in Vermont

and for the Army to take over all or a portion of this station for use with their Ranger battalions? Has that been brought to your attention at all?

Mr. BRYANT. I know consideration was pending by the Air Force with respect to Ethan Allen. From the standpoint of formal action, to my knowledge nothing has been done. May I ask a question of the staff? Do you know anything about this?

Mr. FORE. There has been no proposed Ranger use.

Mr. BRYANT. It has not been proposed to us?

Mr. FORE. That is correct. Use by the Army for Ranger purposes has not been proposed to us.

Mr. BRYANT. The question the chairman is trying to get at is, if we know the Army has a pending requirement in this type of activity that might be susceptible of performance at a base which is going to be inactivated, then it would be our obligation to propose that as a possibility, even though it was not suggested by the service involved. Formally I have not known of the Army's requirement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Assuming such a thing as this were to be effected by the Army or the Navy or the Air Force, is your office not supposed to be advised of the potentiality involved, the retention or the moving or the closing or whatnot?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, if you are not advised, it appears to me that it would be involved in a lot of political power moves up here that can emanate from the Senate and the House, too.

Mr. BRYANT. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. With due respect to both of these bodies, I am not so sure that this is not one of those operations. I will ask you, when you get back to the office, to check into this pretty carefully because the information we have clearly indicates this potentiality. I am of the personal opinion that your office has not been advised of this too clearly as of the moment. I may be in error in my concept.

Mr. BRYANT. I have not been formally advised.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This thing has reached such proportions insofar as its potentiality is concerned, while this committee does not wish to exceed its prerogatives, as long as we are called upon to appropriate funds, these are problems we are very much interested in knowing about. If there is any contemplated change in this arrangement, we want to be advised about it the minute your office knows about it, if you please, sir.

Mr. BRYANT. I assure you of that.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that this committee be consulted and the matter of Ethan Allen be discussed with the committee if there are any plans for its utilization by another service, and that we be apprised of the proposal before it is finalized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the gentleman's request is quite proper, and I shall ask you to comply with it.

Mr. BRYANT. I understand the chairman to ask this, and that will be done.

CAPEHART HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have spoken with reference to the repetitive-type plans and structures. What have you done to formulate standard plans and specifications on a geographical basis for Capehart

housing among the three services? As I recall it, we discussed that potentiality a year and a half or 2 years ago. What has been done in that field? My question is directed to the geographical and climatic conformity, not to trying to associate the untenable with the tenable. That is not important here.

Mr. BRYANT. The standards we have put out in my opinion are not specifically directed to a variety based upon geographical location. One of the reasons for going into that area is the fact that the construction costs in some areas which are climatically favorable are not necessarily in turn low. Our specifications try to get a usable house not only within the limitations the Congress has imposed, but the best house we can get within those limitations and saving as much as possible within those limitations.

It would be presumed that on those specifications and criteria, given favorable geographic location and favorable construction climate, these savings you have in mind could be accomplished within those general provisions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Secretary, I do not know that I was particularly referring to the savings exclusively, because the $16,500 ceiling the Congress set on these housing projects creates a very uncomfortable situation in certain geographical areas. There is no question about that. Very frankly, figuratively speaking, at least, you have to rob Peter to pay Paul in order to get within the ceiling and get any kind of house at all. It was the intent of Congress within that act to see that a house was built not necessarily including a lot of iceboxes and gimcracks. We were to build houses. That was the intent of Congress.

Mr. BRYANT. I am sure of that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You and I both know, and I am sure you know much better than I, that with a $16,500 limit you have trouble in certain geographical areas to get a real house within that limitation.

Mr. BRYANT. That is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What happens? I visited some installations during the recent recess of Congress, and I find you have what are almost crackerboxes in certain areas. I mean that not literally, but it is a reasonable application of the term, if I may say that. The requirements in certain geographical areas of the country, in my honest opinion, could very well pursue the same course the land banks did in their peripheral concept when those wise gentlemen were actually interested in the money markets and what could be done within certain areas. That has always worked beautifully, as we know. When you try to draw an economic line across this country, whether defense control or construction, you will have variations which will be very costly and very defective in the general aspect of what you ultimately get, one compared to the other.

Mr. BRYANT. May I ask a question of the chairman at this point?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Surely.

Mr. BRYANT. Does this envisage in your mind the advisability of more elastic congressionally authorized ceilings?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, it does. Congress has a responsibility here, too. There is no question about that. Any constructor in this country who knows 30 cents worth about construction will tell you that the deviation in price index means that any time you draw a line across the

economy of this country you will be in trouble, because the graph starts hypothetically at A and starts deviating. When you get to the bottom of that graph you are in trouble financially. You have to take off the shingles or something else to depreciate the building down. Whereas if you take it upon the concept of the cost index, you can get what you want and still it will not cost the Government any more, because the law of averages will even it out.

Mr. BRYANT. Would this, in your opinion, envisage a reduction in the instance of the present average ceiling we have of $16,500 in order to accommodate a higher ceiling and higher cost in other geographical areas?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; not necessarily. The result would be that you would build a better house, hypothetically, in the State of Florida than in Michigan, Wisconsin, or New York, and so forth. There is no question about that. As long as that $16,500 limitation stays there, that is it. But if you conform insofar as standardization is concerned and adapt the criteria to the climatic conditions and the costs, you will build a much better house than you are presently building. I do not think any contractor or engineer would disagree with that.

Mr. BRYANT. I understand that. I wanted to get the concept, because I was going to ask another question: Do you want from us for the benefit of the Congress, which ultimately will have to pass upon this, some recommendations in this regard?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would leave that to you people, because you are in the field of setting policy. I am merely indicating my knowledge and observation. What goes on is clearly apparent to anyone who gets out on these projects and gets away from Washington, which you have done and we have done jointly. When we were out there, we found some things we did not know about, did we not?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes; I wish I could get out more often.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am not blaming you, but here is the general condition we have to deal with. The policy is set within the office of DOD as to the economy and expenditure of funds. That is proper. That is where it should be. I am calling attention to that potentiality for somebody to take a look at. Maybe they will agree with me or maybe they will not, but if they go out and review the facts, they will find a difference there which is worthy of consideration.

Mr. BRYANT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Off the record.)

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SHEPPARD. With reference to the problem of hospital construction, I want to pay a compliment to your office and to my colleagues in the Congress. I think you are to be congratulated for the reductions which were achieved, although there is still a question as to whether they were sufficient or not. I believe you have regulations which require that preliminary plans on hospitals be completed prior to submission of the military construction program to the Congress. Have all preliminary plans for hospital construction during the fiscal year 1961 military construction program been approved?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir, they have been.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do the estimates submitted in support of this bill reflect the current working estimates based upon these preliminary plans or upon finalized plans? Which of the two?

Mr. BRYANT. May I check that? I know preliminary plans have been approved. Do they represent finalized plans?

Mr. BARTH. There are very few hospitals in the program, and each case is different. For example, for Aberdeen there is the problem of deciding just what size hospital should be built, and right at present there is a proposal to include a medical facility rather than the original hospital the Army first proposed. So while there are preliminary drawings right now and estimates based upon those, the plans are not finally approved through the Bureau of the Budget. For hospital projects we have gross areas which are approved based upon what we call preliminary studies. Preliminary plans are not permitted to be drawn until the item is a firm item in the program, for the simple reason that the Bureau of the Budget does not want the services to spend A. & E. funds for the preparation of working drawings or beyond preliminary drawings until the item is a firm item in the program.

So, where we have a hospital gross area agreed upon in the program based upon these preliminary studies, we do not have an engineering estimate tailored exactly to that location. The prices which are in the program generally follow a square-foot-cost based upon a study of constructed Hill-Burton hospitals which have been converted to 1961 prices. Then we convert that factor to the local factor. In other words, if we have a 105-cost area or a 110-cost area or a 90-cost area, we convert that cost factor. So our pricing actually is arbitrary pricing. It is budget pricing rather than engineering pricing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. When do you reach the point of engineering pricing?

Mr. BARTH. The engineering pricing will vary as the plans are developed. After the project is approved and the service gets permission to go ahead with the working drawings, we get estimates as the project goes along until we get a finalized estimate with the final working drawings. For instance, I now have on my desk final working drawings and estimates for Lemoore, Calif., which was an item last year. We have followed this hospital right through the preliminary drawings and now into the final drawings. The working drawings now represent a very economical structure. Summarizing, the final estimate is not made until the working drawings are completed, but the project is tailored within the money that is appropriated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That may be a good procedure to follow, but it is an indefinite procedure, even though you may have to do that, based upon the known factor: First, you want a hospital of so many beds. That is the first thing determined. Then it becomes a firm requirement. Obviously, you would have to have some figure in your preliminary concept to put in the budget. I understand that. But the real regulatory aspect which becomes applicable is when your plans are finalized, and that is when you can walk out into the competitive construction market and say, "This is what we want. What will you bid to produce it?" There is quite a difference between the preliminary aspect and the finalization as far as the cost is concerned, is there not?

Mr. BARTH. That is correct. There may be quite a difference. The only thing is, we have in these contract documents a number of alternative items. In other words, if the bid is higher than the amount which

has been appropriated, the hospital may have to suffer a cut in some of these items. We trust these items will not be so essential that it will hurt the hospital. At any rate, we hope then we can tailor the project within the appropriated money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can assume that because in the committee last year we took out a series of hospitals and told the respective departments, "When you go to the Senate you had better do some repricing on this thing." As I recall, it was about $7.5 million less in the final analysis. We did that without prejudice to the hospitals. We knew the requirement was there, but the pricing was all off center. There was no question about that. It was clearly indicated by the end result.

Mr. BARTH. May I point out, if Aberdeen had gone through as originally submitted, the price submitted would have been very accurate, because it would have been based upon the same hospital as Fort Eustis, and the Fort Eustis drawings are practically complete now, ready to go out for bid. In that instance we had very accurate cost figures to present to you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That was predicated upon the comparability of the two buildings, is that correct?

Mr. BARTH. Yes, sir.

FACILITIES TO MOVE WORK FROM PRIVATE PLANTS TO GOVERNMENT FACILITIES

Mr. SHEPPARD. As far as you are concerned, except for the hospitals, are there any items in this program which are based on taking work away from private industry and placing it is Government plants subject to further review, or have they been unequivocally approved by the reviewing authorities in the executive branch?

Mr. BRYANT. I know of none that are pending, answering the first part of your question. I do know that the action necessary to divert from private industry to departmental exercise—we are speaking now of the industrial type complex—does require very firm review not only by our office but primarily by the Office of Supply and Logistics under an existing directive which they issued some time ago. In other words. any new start is first scrutinized under this basic directive with respect to these private enterprise facilities.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has that been done with regard to those in this bill?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

REAL PROPERTY IN HAWAII

Mr. SHEPPARD. While the committee is in receipt of the survey of real properties in the State of Hawaii, which your staff made last year, it reflected a study of what has been accomplished by the military services in the island, primarily the result of a very vigorous approach by the naval district commandant to this problem long before any survey or directives went out from your office or even from this committee. It presents a problem, I understand, in that area, which your survey pointedly ignores. What specifically do you plan to do with reference to Fort DeRussey?

Mr. BRYANT. We have made a recommendation for the consideration of the services, particularly the Army as the cognizant operator of that area, which is a recreational area, as you know.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. BRYANT. Which is designed to accomplish the excessing and disposition of approximately 32 acres, I believe, realizing that in doing that we should have a counterproposal with respect to the maintenance of sufficient space requirements for recreational purposes, and particularly for the temporary accommodation of those coming through and those on the island in the way of quarters, not in the sense of housing but a place to stay temporarily for weekends and such things as that.

This, in our opinion, in order to excess acreage, would require tearing down some of the existing old structures there and building a high rise building which would take less acreage.

In that regard we have made a recommendation to the services, particularly to the Army, for that purpose.

We felt, and this is pursuant to the conversation I had with this committee last year, and we have always felt, as I told you, that the legislative branch ought to be given a program which if in their judgment proved acceptable it would insure, to the extent necessary for the alternate arrangements, some savings, some identification of savings, and allocation of savings through congressional action, for the purpose of providing what might be necessary to replace the facilities which were given away, destroyed, or sold.

The actual program for that, that is to say identification of the size of building, how it is to be occupied, and so forth, is still under study.

What I wanted to bring to your attention also, in the recommendation, was that in essence there will be some disposition of other acreage which may not have to be related to the application of the income therefrom to replacement facilities.

As you know, in competition with other requirements in the military budget, I think the services are particularly and properly concerned as to whether or not they may be able to get independent appropriations after the disposition of properties, the results of which normally would go into the General Treasury otherwise than by congressional action.

Again I want to repeat, because this is something we talked about very definitely last year, that it never has been the idea of this Office, and it never will be, to try to evolve a scheme which would accomplish the utilization of funds created by disposition of properties without specific legislation from the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As far as you are concerned, do you feel that you have the atuhority to order or direct the military service to take specific action with reference to Fort DeRussey and, if you do, what specific action do you propose to recommend?

Mr. BRYANT. I have the authority, and if I do not have it I will get it specifically. We will have the comments of the services with respect to the recommendations which we have already sent forward and which we will present before the Secretary of Defense, if necessary, in order to implement this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This problem has been studied and restudied over a long period of time. It occurs to us some definite action should be taken within the border of what is reason.

Mr. BRYANT. I think so. I feel myself this should be taken in time to become part of the proposal to the Congress in the 1962 budget.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Secretary, you are familiar with the tentative plan agreed upon by the Army and then Territorial Governor of Hawaii?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Would that involve or require congressional appropriations for the replacement of facilities?

Mr. BRYANT. I always took the position that it would. I took the position last year that that tentative agreement of understanding between General White and the Territorial Governor would require legislative action by the Congress of the United States, and probably by the Territory of Hawaii or the State of Hawaii.

Mr. JONAS. Perhaps approval, but I meant appropriationwise. I thought that tentative agreement contemplated that the then Territory of Hawaii would, in exchange for certain of the properties, build the facilities out of their own funds.

Mr. BRYANT. You are quite correct, sir. That agreement did contemplate that.

In my own opinion that would have required Territorial action, obviously, in order to segregate the income which would be derived by the Territory if they were the purchaser.

Mr. JONAS. I think it would be quite wise to seek approval of any such thing from both Congress and the State. I thought it could be accomplished without involving the expenditure of any actual funds, any of our funds, because I had understood the agreement did contemplate, as you have confirmed, that in exchange for certain of the land the Government of Hawaii would construct the buildings which we might need.

Mr. BRYANT. I think we put it in a little bit different package but with the same end, that is, that funds would be generated which, if acceptable to the Congress of the United States might be available for the new type of structure that we contemplated. However, it may not be possible to do this without offering the lands to the highest bidder. In other words, so far as I am concerned, I am anxious to see, and I am sure Congress is, that whatever we propose to them in the way of legislative endorsement is supported by a basic showing that what is disposed of creates the largest possible income.

Mr. JONAS. Do you have any reason to be optimistic over the prospect of getting any approval from either service to do anything with DeRussey?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to hear that. It has been kicked around a long time in Congress and we have been talking about it ever since I have been on this committee. All that has resulted thus far has been studies.

My impression has been that the services would resist doing anything unless they were forced to.

Mr. BRYANT. This has been historically true, but I can say with extreme candor that I think we have proceeded further with better results and with better understanding and with better cooperation than at any time since I have been here.

Mr. JONAS. That is all on that, Mr. Chairman.

CRITERIA FOR MISSILE BASES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Last year we discussed the development of specific criteria for missiles, especially ballistic missiles. What have you been able to accomplish in this field in the past year?

Mr. BRYANT. You refer to the construction aspects, such as launchers?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. BRYANT. We have been able to get considerably further ahead in basic design through experimental process which went on at the beginning. We have also developed a standard of 100 pounds per square inch for the hardened TITAN facilities.

Mr. BARTH. We have developed criteria but they have not been promulgated as yet. There is an instruction written and ready to go.

Mr. BRYANT. However, has there not been considerable progress made in the determination of the optimum type of construction for these installations?

Mr. BARTH. That is true.

Mr. FORE. In the program guidance which has been issued by OSD we have requested, as a result of joint workings with the Departments, that launching facilities scheduled for short-term use, for missiles scheduled to soon phase out due to the rapid growth and change in missiles, that these types of facilities be built to a construction standard consistent with their probable short use duration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You say you are studying that or have completed the study?

Mr. FORE. Instructions have been issued that this will be done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This has been a difficult problem for the committee to cope with because it is a fluctuating concept as represented by the respective services, as you well know. It takes a real effort and it is certainly costing the taxpayers some money.

What is your personal viewpoint of the so-called hardening requirement, Mr. Secretary, if you care to express it at this time?

Mr. BRYANT. Not being an expert I feel a little bit conscious of the fact that I am trying to answer such a question.

In view of the fact, however, that the indications are, for example, that the ATLAS will be superseded by the TITAN and the TITAN by the MINUTEMAN, it seems to me that we can afford, not only in the interest of money-saving but in speed, to risk a degree of soft structure construction in the case of the early ATLAS missiles, at least, which is the present program.

As we go into the MINUTEMAN, they, of course, being in silos, have a certain degree of inbuilt hardness which is more attractive than it is in the ATLAS from the standpoint of protection.

To answer your question as well as I can as an individual, I think we can pursue the program now outlined with a reasonable feeling of safety.

As Mr. Fore just pointed out to me, the first hardened ATLAS will be in the Lincoln, Nebr. location at 100 p.s.i., and those following will be the same. Fairchild and Forbes are 25 p.s.i. in planning.

All of the TITANS are scheduled to be 100 p.s.i., as I stated before.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Take a specific missile as an example. The configuration of the missile does not change too materially. It would

therefore occur to me that insofar as establishing the requirement for the firing, once that requirement is established for X missile, that that principle is then good enough to apply to A, B, and C locations for that particular missile.

The only reservation would be the preparatory groundwork that you might be confronted with because of ground formations, but insofar as total requirements are concerned once you have created what is desirable for X missile is there any reason why that pattern cannot be pursued at other locations?

Mr. BRYANT. I would have to say, and again I want it clearly understood, Mr. Chairman, that I certainly do not propose to be an expert on this, that the proposed configuration of the MINUTEMAN, for example, is so divergent from that contemplated for the ATLAS and/or the TITAN——

Mr. SHEPPARD. I did not mean to confuse the two. Let us just take the MINUTEMAN as an example.

Mr. BRYANT. Right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Once the criteria has been established for the MINUTEMAN, is that criteria not good enough to apply to A, B, C, D, and E?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is that principle intended to be pursued?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

ACQUISITIONS OF WHERRY HOUSING

Mr. SHEPPARD. I refer to page 14 in which you state that you do not believe that the present trend of court awards for Wherry projects is sufficient to provide a basis for revising their procedures at this time.

Mr. BRYANT. The reason I say that, Mr. Chairman, is this: There has been at least one indication that awards at the higher court level will be more favorable from the standpoint of the ultimately allowed amount.

Secondly we have, since our last discussions about this issue here, put into effect the requirement for an OSD review before action by any of the services to proceed with the court process of condemnation. That gives us an opportunity——

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I recall it in your original statement, you stated that insofar as finalization is concerned it had to clear your Office.

Mr. BRYANT. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am getting at the technique being applied by the so-called negotiation boards. There seems to be quite a difference of opinion at that level. I do not say that that concept exists in your Office but I speak of what actually comes down here.

I would like to ask some questions based on that. It is my understanding from your statement that the Department of Defense requires continuing negotiations whenever possible before resorting to condemnation action.

Mr. BRYANT. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How far would you under reasonable circumstances continue negotiations, keeping in mind that Congress has put a formula into the law? Do you have any internal ceilings that are different from the formula?

Mr. BRYANT. I don't know that I can give you a time factor. As a rule, I would believe that in our review of efforts made by the services to find a point of agreement under negotiation there will be variances. When the request for authority to condemn was asked of us, which is our last reviewing opportunity, we will take into consideration not only the time magnitude of the negotiations but the intensity. This we are now doing. That leaves us an opportunity, even so far as practical aspects are concerned, to suggest, because of the risk of condemnation actions being more prejudicial than beneficial, to take another round at negotiation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, your Office would have, as I interpret your response, the right, if you saw fit, to order further negotiations if you determined further negotiations should be entered into?

Mr. BRYANT. That is exactly right, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Appraisals have been mentioned not only here but in various instances as being the outstanding criteria for negotiation purposes. Within the law itself is it your interpretation of the act, as passed by the Congress, that there was authority actually delegated to the appraisers as such, or is that merely a formula to establish a criteria upon which to negotiate?

Mr. BRYANT. The latter, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What has been your experience, as you have reviewed these operations over a period of time, as to whether or not your project operators generally agree with appraisals? What is your experience background there?

I realize that with the formula procedure that X owner or operator may come in and be an arbitrary type of individual, justly or otherwise.

Once you find he is not even remotely inclined to work within the formula level then it is almost arbitrary and you have to go to condemnation. Is that right?

Mr. BRYANT. That is true.

Answering the first question specifically, my observation has been that the appraisal is generally, if not always, felt to be below actual value by the owner, notwithstanding the fact that we have repeatedly advanced to the services this philosophy, that they must also instruct their appraisers in the difference between this type of an acquisition and a general commercial deal. This is not alone a problem of the services; it is also a problem of the established types of rules and regulations under which an appraiser generally operates.

Our effort has been to induce the services to insure that a more realistic appraisal is made by instructing the appraisers to take into consideration these other factors which are not present in the usual commercial acquisition.

Notwithstanding that, last year in particular, from my observation, there was indicated a growing tendency on the part of the owners to be unwilling to accept the appraisal even though it has either of those factors attached to it. There are many reasons for that, not the least of which, to be perfectly honest with you, is the supposition on the part of the owner that he has a real opportunity under court adjudication perhaps to get a better realization, and that does have a great effect upon the reality of the negotiatory process.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us assume you and I were sitting here and acting as a negotiation board. We have our own appraisals, of course, which the Government secures for its own information. I am not questioning the appraisers because I have no reason to do so at the moment.

Suppose that I in turn, as an operator, in good faith employ an appraiser who has a reputable background? Am I privileged to sit down and say, "You have an appraisal of so much." I do not think the appraisal to the Government is shown to the owner, is it?

Mr. BRYANT. I think that is probably right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then would it be within the bounds of good negotiating procedure to say, "Well, all right, if you have a reputable appraiser what is your appraisal?" Have those appraisals compared, and perhaps between the two appraisals you can compromise on what might be a fair figure. Is that part of the operation under negotiation?

Mr. BRYANT. I would say this: I would think that an owner, knowing the requirement on the part of the services to secure an outside appraisal, would be rather derelict in his case, unless he had other reasons such as being afraid, if he did not employ an appraiser of his own and have that appraisal available in negotiation.

It would be highly desirable, if not essential, it seems to me.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In setting up his case in my opinion he would be a stupid businessman if he did not follow that plan. I refer to an appraiser that no one can attack as to reputation.

Mr. BRYANT. That is correct, sir. Getting an appraiser with a good reputation is important. That appraiser's valuation in behalf of the sponsor would have to be supported by detailed background information which in turn would not just be picked out at random but would be pertinent.

I think that is a very desirable thing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Going back to the statement I originally referred to, and I do not take exception to it though I do not agree with it, I ask the following question: There are certainly enough court orders to show that even the formula under the law is on the low side. If you wait until every case goes to the Supreme Court and back again it would indicate, if the Supreme Court follows the pattern of the lower court to a reasonable degree, that you will pay more under condemnation than under negotiation: I think that is clearly indicated. I did not interpret your statement to incorporate that premise.

Mr. BRYANT. I am sorry. In the first place it might be interpreted that I am overly optimistic. I am not. I would like to be in a position of having more than one appeal decided so I could follow that trend. The appelate courts may follow to a large extent the determination of the first court. When I see that, it is time for us to take a very good look at reorganizing our mechanics.

As a matter of fact, we are trying very desperately to see that these condemnation suits are minimized under our present procedure of second look.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think that is right so far as your office and you are concerned personally, but I question that at the lower levels. It is not because of any dishonesty or intent but purely because of application to the job. There is a human element that enters into this

matter which is quite evident. If you check out those cases carefully I think you will agree.

Mr. BRYANT. I cannot argue that point, either, because I think there is a lot to it. I think there is a very grave problem posed on a negotiating officer faced with what appears to be, from the standpoint of recognition by the appraiser, a value which he is hesitant to exceed by any great margin. I know these are restrictive problems.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, there is another item involved here in your ultimate compromise of which your office may take more cognizance than a lower office.

Irrespective of the fact that the U.S. Government has almost an endless number of lawyers available, speaking now of all departments, and that is the cost factor that ultimately goes into carrying these cases up to condemnation.

I wonder if there is anybody in your particular organization at the moment who can give me an approximate estimate of what it costs the Federal Government to carry a case through condemnation?

Mr. BRYANT. I don't think anybody here can do it. I have asked these questions myself and they are difficult to isolate for the obvious reason that the Justice Department, which takes cognizance once the declaration of taking is made, very largely lumps its total operating day-to-day operations together and accept this as one more chore.

I will make a diligent effort for the committee to try to determine an average of what the cost is of carrying these cases.

(The information requested follows:)

Based on information informally obtained from the Department of Justice, the costs to the United States of carrying a Wherry acquisition case through a condemnation range from about $10,000 to about $20,000, depending on whether the case is appealed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it is evident in Wherry projects throughout the country that there are deviations in cost factors. I have never been able to understand the buyer's market or the seller's market. There is no such thing. The only time you have that kind of situation is where you have a project sitting off the base and adjacent to a community which is perhaps low in its housing potential. That would be the only possibility where the buyer and seller aspect can come into consideration even remotely.

Mr. BRYANT. That is a serious factor in this whole problem.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it is also noticeable that we are spending between $2,000 and $3,000 per unit to refurbish the Wherry projects. We have been through the reasoning behind this before but it seems to me that you are getting an owner's equity rather inexpensively. What is the condition of the project you are buying?

I have seen X operator taking good care of his project, for example. Then you go 150 miles from him and find another one which has taken everything out that is possible to take out. There is a big difference in those two projects.

I think each project should stand on the premise of its own ability insofar as what it will cost you to refurbish it plus what it will cost you to get it.

Mr. BRYANT. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The two are companion figures so far as the taxpayer is concerned.

Mr. BRYANT. We recognize that. I am using averages here which are higher than I had hoped they would be just because of the ceiling of $3,000. We were admonished that this was not to be use used as a yardstick.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. BRYANT. At the same time, in addition to the criteria we have put out with respect to the rehabilitation of these projects of general character, we look at the plans as they are proposed by the services before they are endorsed. This is not only from the dollar viewpoint but also from the standpoint of whether or not the alterations are realistic, whether they will accomplish the purpose desired, whether they do make a more livable house, and whether they do take care of the deficiency.

This is an individual scrutiny we make after the proposal comes in.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the real answer to the problem is based upon one saving factor, Mr. Secretary. I come to the court on one premise, not because of my desire but because it is mandatory under the law that I be there.

The psychology back of the whole thing was, as you perhaps know better than I, that the people who were in the Wherry project, whether we like them or dislike them, whether they did a good job or bad job, were invited into this picture by the Federal Government. They were asked to come in to bail us out when we needed them.

Now we issue a contract. The contract speaks for itself, whether it is between you and I or the Federal Government and its people.

I think the Federal Government has a responsibility to live up to its contract as meticulously as it can with honest payments. I really think that.

If we do not set that example we cannot expect the other fellow to live up to his part of the bargain.

So here we have an anticipated income over a long period of years. Through happenstance of legislation now he finds that is out the window.

Let me ask you this: You were a private businessman and had considerable to do in the field of procurement before you came here.

Mr. BRYANT. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Buying commodities that were necessary for people you represented, and I understand you did a fine job.

You enter into a contract with X person wherein you anticipate an income over a period of time. All at once you wake up and the rug is yanked out from under you and you are told, "I am sorry, but this is it."

Then it is a question of compromise as to who is right and wrong, not only on how good is this housing unit but what is owed in accordance with the original contract. I am the party injured because the Government yanked the rug from under me.

Is that an important part of negotiation?

Mr. BRYANT. There are many ramifications. It is reasonable. I understand that and I will state that immediately.

I do not know of any contract guarantees entered into at the beginning between the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, and others. I will not debate the fact there was an implied moral obligation, however, because they were invited into this area, in effect.

However, from a strictly contractual standpoint——

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to change that. These operators accepted their leases which were predicated upon amortizing a project over a period of years.

While it may not have been literally said "that I hereby agree to an expiration as of such and such a date," nothing in those leases showed a deviation from the original agreement.

Mr. BRYANT. That is right.

The location upon which this was built, for example, Mr. Chairman, was for an indefinite time. That is one premise. There was a risk involved in that, of course, and you and I as businessmen would recognize that.

In the second place, except for the requirement of mandatory acquisition which was part of the construction of Capeharts, which were competitive, and did have a serious effect upon the continued usefulness of the Wherry, I come to a more dubious area when I get to this question of why must we buy them when they are not affected by the Capeharts, but because the situation is not as rosy as it looked at the time it started.

I think this leads us into a little more difficult area.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can go along with that assumption up to a point. Again the pattern of procedure is changed. As Congress considered the question in the days of the Wherry Act originally I was interested in two principles of the act. I worked with this very closely because many aspects were discussed with me. I hope I contributed something.

I watched the pattern of procedure all the way up. There were certain financial limitations. Again those specifications were laid down by the Federal Government and not by the contractor and not by the operator.

We, the Government, said, "All right: you will build this type of a housing project within so much money." We had our inspectors there to enforce all of the requirements of the contract, at least so far as I know.

There was a definite commitment on the part of the Federal Government to get its people. The only way it was felt those people could be protected was by saying, "All right, if you want additional housing under the Capehart Act you will have to buy Wherry housing."

Perhaps that should have been spelled out more thoroughly than it was and certain types of Wherry housing should not have been included because of lack of care, upkeep, and so forth.

However, it is the law, and as it is we have to live with it.

The only thing I desire to see the Federal Government do is not to expend unnecessary money, but in turn I do not want to see a lot of chiseling, either, and we have had some chiseling.

Mr. BRYANT. I think I have knowledge of some to which you refer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those are all the questions I have.

Mr. Sikes?

INACTIVATION OF FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Secretary, normally how far in advance of the closing of a base are you notified that the base is no longer required by one of the services?

Mr. BRYANT. That will vary. In recent months it has been much more acute from the standpoint of time interval due to the revision of thinking, particularly in the case of the Air Force, as to its mix of manned aircraft and missiles.

I do not think I could give you a definite answer on that, Mr. Sikes, except to say that the opportunity of becoming aware of the iminence of the closing 2 years ago or 3 years ago was greater than it has been in this last year.

We know that these studies are going on. We know that generally speaking there will be a reduction in volume. I speak specifically now of airbases.

We cannot, however, until it is concluded, but guess as to how much and particularly as to where, so that the time interval between the time we become acquainted with the actual fact or contemplation of closing and the phasing out is shorter than most of us would like to see.

Mr. SIKES. I have a list before me, for instance, of Air Force bases which are scheduled for closing in fiscal 1960 and fiscal 1961.

Mr. BRYANT. We have some of them.

Mr. SIKES. Actually programing is now starting for the fiscal 1962 budget, so presumably, unless you know what bases will be closed in 1962, you may be planning now for construction in some of the bases which later will be declared excess and scheduled for closing in fiscal 1962.

Mr. BRYANT. In that case the only thing we can do is this: We have advance notice in many instances, but not in as many as we would like.

What we do in that case, and the only thing we can do, is this: When the program is being put up to us for review and the 1962 budget program is now starting, under the general instructions we issue, knowing there may be uncertainty, we do our utmost to find out during the review period where this might strike, and those we put a caution sign on.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have now a list of bases which probably will be closed in 1962?

Mr. BRYANT. If we haven't the complete one we will have it before the present review which is going on to determine requirements of the services. We have some information for 1962, yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. According to the information which you have for public record or for the committee's information what bases are programed for closing in 1962 in the respective services?

Mr. BRYANT. I would have to answer that by saying that in some instances, and the degree varies, these would be tentatively identified at the present time, and therefore I do not think they are a matter of public knowledge. They are merely a guide to us from the standpoint of caution.

Others will have been identified but not formally proposed for disposition even on a phased year.

Mr. SIKES. Do you now have a list for the committee?

Mr. BRYANT. I think I would rather put it this way, Mr. Sikes: Anything about which the responsive service is certain in its own mind, which it has certainly determined to be excessed or diminished in scope within the next 2 years and there is no alternative possibility involved, certainly in my opinion would be available.

Mr. SIKES. Have any of the services given you a list of bases they propose to close in 1962?

Mr. BRYANT. I do not know that I can answer that categorically. Mr. Whittet, have you a list?

Mr. WHITTET. We have a list of certain bases which will be phased out in 1962, 1963, and 1964. It will take that long.

Mr. SIKES. But they are identified?

Mr. WHITTET. They are identified. This is particularly true of the Navy and the Air Force, but not of the Army.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Sikes has asked what are those bases. He also asked the question, are we in a position to deny information or to fail to give information to this committee with respect to those programs.

Mr. WHITTET. On those decided to be phased out in those particular years, the information is available to the committee. I cannot give it from memory. I can furnish it to the committee..

Mr. SIKES. What does that mean, that we get a list, or that do we not get a list?

Mr. WHITTET. You do, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have it with you?

Mr. WHITTET. No, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Furnish the list to the committee, please.

(The information requested was furnished the committee.)

Mr. SIKES. How frequently are these lists changed after you receive them and before they become public knowledge?

Mr. BRYANT. This I tried to cover in my preceding remarks. Where the determination has been definitely made, I would say there is little likelihood of change. Where tentative plans, not identified necessarily with respect to one or two or three bases, are involved, those plans could change. What Mr. Whittet said, which I will accept for the record, is that with respect to those which are identifiable and have been marked and are programed for deactivation, these are firm.

Mr. SIKES. According to information available to you, what is the status of Williams Air Base in Arizona?

Mr. BRYANT. Personally, I do not have a recollection about it myself at the present moment. Do you want me to get that information?

Mr. SIKES. Does anyone here have information on that?

Mr. WHITTET. Mr. Sikes, I think Williams is under study by the Air Force. I cannot say what decision has been made on it.

Mr. SIKES. It had been the understanding of this committee that Williams was definitely scheduled for closing because of budget limitations until last Friday, when it was decided that, instead, it would be used as a primary air training school. Why would there be such a sudden reversal of a decision on a base which has been characterized as no longer needed by the Air Force?

Mr. BRYANT. I will try to answer that, Mr. Sikes. I do not know. I will try to find out. I might mention, as just a guess, there might be involved the determination to which you referred this morning, to eliminate, for all practical purposes, contract flying training, but I am not sure that this is the reason.

Mr. SIKES. There are other examples I might cite. I have the feeling that sometimes things are entering into the selection of bases which have nothing to do with the practicability of the operation of that base or with the requirements of the service, and it is disappointing to

me if considerations other than the actual requirement for a base enter into decisions of this kind. Do you wish to comment?

Mr. BRYANT. I would share those opinions wholeheartedly. To my knowledge, these decisions are made and determinations and selections are made on a purely operative requirement basis.

Mr. SIKES. When we campaign for office, we run up against a certain category of people who are for the last fellow who got to them. I am beginning to have the feeling that base closures sometimes are a sort of hit-or-miss thing, subject to frequent change in the Department; that it is a matter of who got to the Department last. I will not ask you to comment on that.

Mr. BRYANT. Thank you.

Mr. SIKES. I think you will find it is seldom a base which is programed for closing by one service is used by another service or even by that service for other purposes.

The question I want to ask you is why it is not possible to make greater use of these. I know the stock answers. We have had them many times. But other bases are constantly being expanded, and sometimes new ones are being built, at the same time that old ones are being closed. The trend is toward consolidation, toward ever-bigger bases. We have $100 million bases. They are not uncommon, as a matter of fact. Would it not be as well for the Department of Defense to insist upon a higher degree of dispersal in its facilities in order to utilize existing facilities and thereby save dollars for the taxpayer?

Mr. BRYANT. This may be regarded also as a stock answer, but I am quite concerned, Mr. Sikes, in my business at least, every day to insure——

Mr. SIKES. But we do not see much result coming from that effort. The bases are not used by the other services. Instead, we build new, big bases somewhere else.

Mr. BRYANT. I am not aware of any new bases.

Mr. SIKES. Then we continue to expand the bases we have——

Mr. BRYANT. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. Instead of dispersing the activities. I am not convinced that some of these activities could not be dispersed, perhaps not quite as conveniently, but to all intents and purposes as effectively for the national defense. In addition dispersal is important in a nuclear age.

Mr. BRYANT. This I will admit is possible. I think, however, the other side of the question may be such as this: The economies involved—this may have to be compared with dispersal, as you put it—often dictate the enlargement of an existing installation because it fits so handily with the other requirements imposed upon the installation, rather than doing it at another base, a distant or even close-by base as far as that is concerned. Elements of logistics and other things are involved in this. So I think each one of these has to be examined in considerable detail before I could give a specific answer. We do lend every effort to the utilization and point out to the services the possibility of utilization of that which is excess and that which is surplus as a means of accomplishing the maximum utilization. The answers we get in most instances have been sufficiently concrete and sufficiently demonstrable to be convincing. This, I will say, is not necessarily an answer to your question about how much more you can afford to pay to disperse.

Mr. SIKES. Every service wants new facilities and wants a lot of them. Somebody must start remembering the taxpayer in these considerations, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. BRYANT. In my review, the taxpayer's interests are paramount. This is designed to insure the maximum use of what we have and the disposition of what we do not need. It is hoped that in many of these instances of disposition the tax rolls will be improved by virtue of the fact that the properties may, hopefully, be put to a better or higher use from the standpoint of the tax base and taxable return.

Mr. SIKES. Let me go off the record.

(Off the record.)

NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

Mr. SIKES. Where and what negotiated contracts do you anticipate you will have to make during fiscal 1961? You said there would be a very few negotiated contracts.

Mr. BRYANT. Generally speaking, these are related to some overseas areas where there are local requirements which prohibit the usual advertising and low bid determination. Some of them are with respect to highly technical type of construction which not too many contractors are capable of performing. In some instances in that case, also, those who have demonstrated their ability to do this sort of job and have the tools at hand and the capacity are negotiated with.

EFFECT OF DISARMAMENT TALKS OF FISCAL YEAR 1961 PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. In view of the fact that there seems to be a stronger effort to achieve some degree of disarmament than we have had before and the possibility of some success, would it be well to postpone as much construction as possible temporarily, and to use temporary facilities where they are, pending the outcome of those talks?

Mr. BRYANT. I would answer that by differentiating between certain types of activity. So far as support is concerned, yes. I would be reluctant at this point, personally, to advocate postponement or delay or any serious interference with the program, for example, with respect to our ballistic missiles, because I think if we are to have disarmament it will come from strength and not from a show of weakness.

Mr. SIKES. I think the committee supports that, but has the disarmament possibility entered into the formulation of this budget insofar as the purely support activities are concerned, the housekeeping facilities and things of that sort, which are now in temporary facilities?

Mr. BRYANT. I would have to answer accurately that I do not believe the prospect of a cessation of hostilities or a more tranquil world had any bearing in the determination of this program which is before you now in that sense. I do know that we are activated in keeping to a minimum the type of structures that are necessary to support some of these programs which we feel were not expected to be too long in existence or would be phased out in preference to others. But per se, I would have to answer that I do not think we have a yardstick which was applied in reducing this program from the standpoint of an assumption of a less bellicose world in the near future.

REAL PROPERTY IN HAWAII

Mr. SIKES. I missed your answers to some of the questions about land being released in Hawaii. How much is being released and from what services?

Mr. BRYANT. All four services actually have already accomplished the release of some 3,000 acres. There is a second round which is going on now, having to do not only with reductions about which the chairman specifically asked me, but also with respect to certain areas which were at the time of our last review put on the shelf for further inspection and the answer to certain questions which we posed. I can guess as to what that might be, but it will be of greater magnitude than we have accomplished so far.

Mr. SIKES. Will you provide for the record the acreage which is in process of being released and the acreage which will be left in the ownership of the services?

Mr. BRYANT. To the extent we now have the answer, yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

REAL PROPERTY HOLDINGS—HAWAII

Fee and section 91 ceded real property totaling 3,012 acres are currently in process of being excessed. This will reduce the total holdings in fee simple and ceded lands to 82,311 acres, a reduction of over 5 percent.

RENTAL HOUSING FOR THE MILITARY SERVICES

Mr. SIKES. Last year Congress passed a housing bill which contained a new section 810 to provide rental housing for the military services. Rental housing is something which the Department of Defense has wanted for a long time, and yet at most bases the servicemen have had only the choice of buying if they live in new quarters other than Government facilities. We had hoped at the time that the new section 810 would provide a solution to the problem of rental housing for the military services. The previous sections dealing with rental housing for military personnel had not operated satisfactorily. Yet we find that the military services themselves are holding up this program by delaying the issuance of the regulations under which the programs can operate. Since it was designed for the military, and the military are the ones who need it and hope to benefit from it, it is difficult for us to understand why on this date, April 27, you have not yet issued the regulations to permit a program to be implemented which was passed last summer.

Mr. BRYANT. I will go back, if I may. The answer to that is that at the time the bill became effective sometime in August, we began immediately discussions with the Federal Housing Administration, a necessary partner in this enterprise, to try to develop standards under which this provision could be operated with a greater degree of interest and control, if you want, by the military than was evident in the law. Those reasons I am sure would be obvious to you. Since it was our conviction that the FHA would in most instances invoke the guarantee provision, we wanted to be sure the housing would be susceptible to military supervision, not only from the standpoint of its inception but, so far as possible, during its operation. We had a considerable struggle, I can assure you.

We finally arrived at a meeting of minds with the Federal Housing Administration about the beginning of this year. Our instructions were put out. They were put out belatedly, I will admit, from the standpoint of its utilization in the 1961 program. However, in putting out our regulations and instructions to the services, I wrote a specific paragraph saying:

If you have anything which you now feel would be useful under this provision, you may present it and we will endeavor to get it into the fiscal 1961 bill, even though it is a late date.

We have had some which are being proposed presently to the Senate authorization committee, the subcommittee of the Armed Services Subcommittee. I have not the slightest idea whether these will work out to be practical or not. The concern of the services, Mr. Sikes, seems to me to be normal, because I find it difficult to believe that an acceptable type of rental quarters can be developed within the financial restrictions imposed by the bill at present prices and within the limitations of housing allowances of those who would be using these quarters. This would be very largely, as you pointed out, the lower echelon group in the services. Let us say, to pick out something as an average, the $90 group. To build a house within those rental limitations would result in a pretty skimpy house in these days.

I think they were afraid they would get some shoddy type of quarters, and they were further afraid if the thing did not work out there would be an obligation imposed to purchase the sponsor's project, and they would be stuck with something they did not want. This is literally true.

I made the plea that this be at least experimented with, because nobody could demonstrate it unless there were some test cases. We have had two or three proposals, not specific, but a certain stated capacity on the part of sponsors to do this and to live within these limitations. I myself, as I testified before the Armed Services Committee of the House, still have some mental reservations concerning what will work out.

Mr. SIKES. Will you submit for the record a listing of the limiting factors which make this program appear somewhat doubtful in your mind?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

(The information requested follows:)

In order to operate successfully under the section 810 program, private interests must provide housing to rent at prices which military personnel can afford to pay. In general, the military man's ability to pay is limited by his basic allowance for quarters, which ranges from $51.30 to $96.90 per month for enlisted men and from $85.50 for first lieutenants and warrant officers to $136.80 per month for colonels. The average quarters allowance is about $92 per month.

Assuming that military personnel might be willing to pay somewhat more than his allowance for good housing, it is believed that $100 is a good average figure for rent and utilities. With this rent limitation in mind, it is found that there are two economic factors which would tend to prevent a landlord from being able to provide good housing under section 810:

First, experience shows that a five-room house should cost, on the average, about $12,000 to $13,000. This would mean that gross rent would have to be about $125 per month, compared to the average quarters allowance of $92 per month. It is not believed that more than a few military personnel would be able to pay this price. Assuming that most military personnel would not be

willing to pay more than $100 per month, the cost of the housing should not exceed $10,000 per unit. Therefore, it appears that housing which would be reasonably acceptable in terms of rents can be built only in low-cost areas.

Second, rents might be reasonable in the beginning, but in many cases they would eventually be increased (due to increased costs of maintenance and operation and higher taxes) to levels which military personnel could not afford. There were numerous instances of excess vacancies in Wherry projects which resulted from this same condition.

Although section 810 housing would be provided for military and civilian personnel, occupancy by military personnel could not be assured because they could not be assigned as in the case of public quarters and Capehart housing. Thus, if rents were high or if the housing was not attractive to individual prospective military tenants, they would be free to live elsewhere. Numerous examples of this condition were also found in the Wherry program.

Mr. SIKES. Do you feel we shall be able to utilize the program under the present law, or do you think it will have to be amended?

Mr. BRYANT. I am afraid it will have to be amended, but I would like to try it out, first. I think it will be most likely to succeed in areas which are adjacent to large communities where that type of housing could be converted, if it had to be, into low-cost housing requirements which the city might have other use for.

Mr. SIKES. Would you hazard a guess when it will be implemented?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir. It has been implemented. It is in the hands of the Services at the present time. There are, as I said, some which have been advanced. Because of the requirement of the Armed Services Committee in the House bill that they be made line items, we have been offered the opportunity to get some projects in before the Senate subcommittee and I will give you a list of those.

Mr. SIKES. Do you mean this is a list of proposed projects?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, those which have been recommended by the services without identification as to exact site, but the location, without identification of the builder or the specifications or anything of that nature. It is just an authorization item.

Mr. SIKES. Will you supply such a list for us?

Mr. BRYANT. I shall do that.

(The information requested follows:)

The following family housing projects were proposed to the Senate Armed Services Committee for authorization of construction under the section 810 program:

	Units
Naval activities, New York	500
Naval Air Station, New Iberia, La	178
A.C. & W. Station, Crystal Springs, Miss	27

Mr. SIKES. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman on my left.

REAL PROPERTY IN HAWAII

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Secretary, why do you consider it necessary to retain a commissary in the middle of downtown Honolulu, the Richards Street Commissary?

Mr. BRYANT. Because it grew there before my time, I do not know. Mr. Norton, please.

Mr. NORTON. Gentlemen, we plan and hope that that commissary can be moved to a better location than on ceded property on the Esplanade lots.

Mr. JONAS. Is this not an inconvenient location?

Mr. NORTON. Not to the people who go there. They are too valuable pieces of property.

Mr. JONAS. It is right in the heart of the business section of Honolulu.

Mr. NORTON. A very poor facility.

Mr. JONAS. Far removed from military installations.

Mr. NORTON. Not so far removed in case of the people who live in Honolulu, but there are better locations; for example, Fort Shafter and some other places.

Mr. JONAS. Hickam Field.

Mr. NORTON. Yes, it could go there. Right now there is increased traffic there. The main thing is, it is really a piece of junk sitting on a very valuable piece of property. It is not good management to have it there.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Secretary, in the statement you furnished the committee, the so-called inventory or report on study of military real property in the State of Hawaii, on page 12, in explanation of the decision not to transfer Wheeler Field to Schofield Barracks and Fort Kamehameha to the Air Force, it is said that one reason for that decision is that the Air Force has 12 separate organizations at Wheeler Field. Can you give us a list of those installations and organizations?

Mr. NORTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. What are they?

Mr. NORTON. I do not have that here, sir. I will furnish it for the record.

Mr. JONAS. Are they not listed in one of your exhibits to that prepared document?

Mr. NORTON. You can pick most of them out of there, sir. We will give you a full list.

(The information requested follows:)

Wheeler Air Force Base roster of assigned organizations (strength as of Oct. 31, 1959)

	Officers	Airmen	Civilians	Total
6487th Support Squadron	10	154	119	
326th Air Division	14	34	3	
Air Materiel Force, Pacific	40	36	27	
1st Weather Wing	66	92	5	
6486th USAF Disp O/L	4	14		
Detachment 1, 6005th Air Postal Group		1		
Headquarters PACAF O/L		6		
Detachment 1, Headquarters Air Rescue Service	9	4		
Headquarters, Pacific AACS Area (MATS)	41	77	25	
1957th AACS	4	110		
Field representative (FE)	8	42		
6920th Security Wing	59	213	6	
Total	255	783	185	1,223
U.S. Army:				
25th Aviation Company	55	182		
922d Transportation Company	2	80		
150th Heavy Helicopter	1	12		
Total	58	274		332

Mr. JONAS. Is that list set forth on page 6, exhibit 7, accurate? I refer to the top of the page, Wheeler Air Force Base, page 6 of the exhibits.

Mr. NORTON. This shows the major Air Force units.

Mr. JONAS. Among those listed is the 922d Transportation Company. How far is the nearest Air Force installation from Wheeler Field that would be served by that transportation company?

Mr. NORTON. It lies really between two potentials, Dillingham and Hickam.

Mr. JONAS. How far are they from Wheeler?

Mr. NORTON. An even distance, about 15 miles each way.

Mr. JONAS. Is that not a poor location for a transportation company, 15 miles away from the nearest service installation which it serves?

Mr. NORTON. This transportation company, sir, is not local transportation. It is for the Pacific.

Mr. JONAS. It is located in the interior of the island. You mean it handles transport for the entire Pacific area?

Mr. NORTON. That is right, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Would it not be better to locate it near the harbor instead of 15 miles inland?

Mr. NORTON. It is an administrative function, sir. I do not believe it is material.

Mr. JONAS. What about the Air Force dispensary? Is it not a poor place to have a dispensary to serve the Air Force when the nearest Air Force installation is 15 miles distant?

Mr. NORTON. Of course, sir, quite a few Air Force people work at Wheeler.

Mr. JONAS. I know, and they are going to keep on working there as long as you keep Wheeler as an Air Force installation instead of turning it over to Schofield, which is within rock-throwing distance of it.

Mr. NORTON. Sir, the only real use or function the Army has for Wheeler is their light aviation units. They are now utilizing Wheeler. They have all they need for that function.

Mr. JONAS. They need the housing, do they not?

Mr. NORTON. No more than the Air Force does, sir.

Mr. JONAS. The proposition was to turn over to the Air Force Fort Kamehameha and move the Army people out, back up to Wheeler, and move the Air Force out of Wheeler down to Fort Kamehameha. You have Fort Kamehameha right at Hickam Field, and it is Army housing. You have Wheeler right at Schofield, occupied by the Air Force.

Mr. NORTON. Sir, a large number of the 107 houses at Fort Kamehameha are inadequate under our present regulations. Furthermore, they are all very old. They do not begin to be as adequate as the houses at Wheeler Air Force Base.

Mr. JONAS. Are you not getting around to the real reason for the decision; namely, that the Air Force just does not want to give up that housing at Wheeler?

Mr. NORTON. Of course, the trade would not be equitable in any sense.

Mr. JONAS. We are not talking about equities. We are running a Government. The Defense Department is running the whole Defense Department and not one service as distinct from another.

Mr. NORTON. Of course, Fort Kamehameha would not remain there forever. Fort Kamehameha has already been promised to the Department of Commerce if and when the State of Hawaii and/or the FAA jointly decide to build a new runway at Hickam International Airport. That runway will take up practically all the property at Fort Kamehameha.

Mr. JONAS. Not according to the map I have seen. It will take off just one corner of it, and a small corner.

Mr. NORTON. It goes all the way, sir.

Mr. JONAS. You and I have seen different maps.

Mr. NORTON. The map I have seen, sir, is the FAA's projection of where that runway will go.

Mr. JONAS. Is not the answer to my question the so-called equity answer that you gave, instead of the fact that the Air Force needs all these units at Wheeler?

Mr. NORTON. No, sir; the Air Force population at Wheeler is quite great. There are many functions there. There is no place else. There is no room at Hickam. If these men are to work at Wheeler, they must be housed. If you take the housing at Wheeler away from the Air Force, we do not want the men to be housed at Hickam. In other words, if we would do what you are talking about, the Air Force would be in just as bad a position as the Army thinks it is in now.

MAINTENANCE OF CAPEHART HOUSING

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Secretary, have you any records which will show maintenance costs on Capehart housing?

Mr. BRYANT. We are accumulating that right now, sir, and the instructions were issued some few months ago. The best we can give you at the present time is that they will run somewhere between $50 and $65 a month, possibly on the higher order rather than lower. We have tried to break that down as to its reality. I think the first thing to bear in mind in reviewing that cost, which on the face of it appears excessive, in a comparison with privately operated apartments, we will say, is that there is a great deal more involved in the case of the Capehart than there is normally in the case of a rented apartment. That is to say, not only the utilities and the maintenance, but also the disposal of garbage and other services that are generally purchased by a tenant in addition to the maintenance of roads, streets, and so forth, which is involved in the project, also, which have to be reallocated.

Mr. JONAS. Do you have a report of any architectural consulting firm which indicates that this cost is about $90 per unit per month?

Mr. BRYANT. Do we?

Mr. BARTH. Yes, and I think the report indicates the cost of maintenance may be approximately the same amount as the mortgage amount.

Mr. BRYANT. That would be the answer to the question.

Mr. BARTH. It was not based upon any detailed data that the architect-engineer got.

Mr. JONAS. Did that report indicate it is about $90 per unit per month?

Mr. BARTH. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Is that report accurate, or do you question it?

Mr. BRYANT. We have questioned it, and we are trying to get an accurate figure by running these tests. This involves the utilization of mechanical means which we have not heretofore done and which is not normally done at a post, station, or installation; that is to say, individual metering for units or samples in a project, at least, and the breakdown of these other costs which are so intimately interwoven with the maintenance of the base itself.

Mr. JONAS. Why, then, would your office refuse to consider a contract proposed by private industry to handle this maintenance at $35 a unit?

Mr. BRYANT. I do not know that we have refused. I do not know whether it is the same outfit or not that you are referring to which came in to see us.

Mr. BARTH. Yes; it is the same one.

Mr. BRYANT. Would you venture to try to respond in detail to the Congressman on that?

Mr. BARTH. The representatives of that company visited us and indicated they were going back over the proposal they had made to us and make certain things more clear. Actually, the $35 they proposed did not cover the entire package that we are talking about.

Mr. JONAS. What was left out?

Mr. BARTH. The collection of trash and garbage is not included. Mr. Bryant's testimony of $50 to $65 per month per unit includes services such as fire protection, police protection, trash and garbage collection. It also includes furniture repair. It includes operation. The contractor——

Mr. JONAS. Furniture repair?

Mr. BARTH. Furniture repair, yes, Government furniture.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On "X" station you have fire equipment for the preservation and protection of the entire station. How do you break down the ratio and charge it against the housing project?

Mr. BARTH. That is one of the difficult points that we have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are including a utility service as against that which is commonly called maintenance.

Mr. BARTH. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I presume from the statement of my colleague that the difference in the cost is an estimated figure that you run here because you cannot break down your fire costs, police costs, or anything else. You know it and I know it. So you are taking a shotgun estimate. Is that right or wrong?

Mr. BARTH. In those respects, but we are not taking a shotgun estimate in garbage collection, trash collection, or furniture repair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. BARTH. Another thing——

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let us go back to furniture. You have a maintenance crew on every base I have ever visited, with the exception of two.

Mr. BARTH. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Those men are charged to the base in general, and the expense comes out of the general fund. How do you break down the repair of furniture on a housing project?

Mr. BARTH. We have a team out trying to break these costs down so we could know them a little more accurately. There is one other significant item in the proposal by the contractor. He is talking maintenance only for $35. Our cost includes operation; in other words, the electricity that we use, the gas we use, the fuel. That is not included in his figure, which of course is a sizable item.

Mr. JONAS. Do you charge utilities up to maintenance?

Mr. BARTH. The $50 to $65 Mr. Bryant was talking about is the estimated cost of maintenance and operation.

Mr. JONAS. As a matter of fact, the same situation described by the chairman with respect to fire protection applies to garbage. You have garbage contractors to handle the garbage on the entire post, have you not?

Mr. BARTH. But we shall be able, I am sure, as a result of these trips to prorate the cost so we know exactly what it costs.

Mr. JONAS. As a matter of fact, this concern which tried to get the contract offered to take care of all the garbage for just $3 a month per unit, which would make $38.

Mr. BARTH. I should say we are still talking to this group. We have not closed our discussions with them.

Mr. JONAS. What is the prospect of giving somebody a contract on a pilot basis to try out this system instead of your hiring civil service personnel to do all this maintenance?

Mr. BARTH. Right now, the pilot study proposed first was for, I believe, 14 projects, was it not, Mr. Bryant?

Mr. BRYANT. I have forgotten.

Mr. BARTH. Some large number. Then a second proposal was made of just a few, perhaps six bases. Our preliminary thinking is along the lines that when we finalize what we think we want or what we think we might want, it should be on an open bidding basis rather than on a negotiated contract with one concern.

Mr. JONAS. When did you start these negotiations?

Mr. BARTH. We have not been negotiating with them at all, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is just the point I made. They cannot get you to negotiate, and why?

Mr. BRYANT. Two reasons. One is that we wanted to identify just what remained for us to do under any given type of contract. Secondly, we wanted to know that we got the best price we could for that type of service if we did decide to do it.

Mr. JONAS. In the meantime, we keep on paying out anywhere from $50 to $92 a month per unit to maintain these units.

Mr. BRYANT. We are trying to identify that, Mr. Congressman. I do not accept the higher figure. I am sure we can come in here and pin these down. It is the sort of thing which is generally not available but can be, and we are in process of acquiring that information at the present time. That will give us something tangible to match against. What I would like to do as a personal matter, if the savings suggest it, is to contract out to private enterprise, but I want to be sure I have the same yardsticks when I decide which is the way to go.

You spoke about the utilization of civil service people in these activities. Many of these people would not be disposed of because of their requirement in other aspects of the base operation, we will say, in addition to which many of them have long-term standing and rights

and accumulated benefits, and that sort of thing, which I think must be taken into consideration. So it is not a simple matter of saying, generally speaking, that a private operator should be able to do a better job, particularly on a group basis, because I think any one of us would be inclined to believe that this is not only possible, but probable. But I do not think we are in a position, at least I would be unhappy, to try this except on a limited scale and with the knowledge that the suggested price had some demonstrable relationship to what we would get with what we are now paying and what we would have to pay in addition, perhaps, to the given service. This we are trying to find out. I can assure you personally that it is not an ingrained objection on my part to the utilization of that sort of service but, on the contrary, it is my purpose to seek it if I can get it for the right price.

Mr. JONAS. I read a half paragraph from the December 1959 issue of House and Home, and ask for your comment.

More than a year ago the Senate Armed Services Committee estimated from facts available that Capehart housing maintenance and management were averging at least $75 per unit per month. Noting pointedly that this was about twice the $35 to $40 a month for housing projects operated by private industry, the committee twice warned Defense Secretary McElroy to give this matter close scrutiny.

How much scrutiny has been given it during the last year?

Mr. BRYANT. Quite a little. In addition to our own efforts to isolate these charges and better to demonstrate the actual figures, which have been admittedly guesstimates, Mr. Congressman—and this has taken both time and study—it will serve two purposes: It will identify the average costs that we are now paying through our present activities and present setup versus a comparison with outside operations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. JONAS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where you are serving a station with blanket coverage, electricity, for example, about the only way you will create individual segregation of the cost is by metering the house itself.

Mr. BRYANT. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has it ever occurred to the military that they might be economically better off if they said to the leasing people, let us say Southern California Edison, for example, serving George Air Force Base, go ahead and serve and function on the base in the same way you do in residential areas and on the same basis that you do in housing projects which are off the base?

Mr. BRYANT. It not only occurred to me but, as a matter of fact, I have made some of those deals in California. They are quite acceptable. The difficulty we had was in relating to a housing project the wholesale costs that we got for the base, but we were able to bridge that gap, too. It was obvious in the beginning that the electrical companies, and so forth, wanted to take over this job on the basis of the individual metering cost. These were Wherry projects, by the way. But this has been handled, and handled very nicely, and I think with credit to the companies involved as well as to the services and, to a little extent, if you wish, our own Office.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think you and I both know the average electric company is looking for load factor.

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The bigger load factor they can get—I do not blame them for taking a look at the individual service if they can get away with it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Secretary, I will tell you what disturbs me. I do not personally care whether you do it inshop or whether you contract it out, it means absolutely nothing to me except I would rather see private industry do the work than for Government employees to be hired to do it. If the facts set forth in this article are anywhere near true and we are spending $75 or even $60 per unit per month, and private owners spend from $35 to $40, there is something wrong and it needs to be corrected, and I do not think it ought to take a year to correct it. That is what disturbs me.

Mr. BRYANT. I would agree with you it should be corrected.

Mr. JONAS. Just giving it scrutiny does not satisfy me. I would like to know whether you have made any progress and what is holding up your decision.

Mr. BRYANT. I was just able to tell the chairman we have made some progress in this line in connection with electrical service. I am sure that I shall be able to show you some progress in this problem. I think the very fact that we have directed this barrage against the services because of these estimates which are going around has alerted them to the necessity of a more careful operation themselves.

For example, we have not only recommended but are insisting that tenants who come into these projects, these dwelling units, be admonished as to the manner in which they handle their utilities. "Don't leave your lights on all night." If they are found doing that, they are criticized. If they damage the place unnecessarily, we have asked the services to penalize them financially.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And they are doing it.

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

I would say, while this is something which cannot be demonstrated so much in dollars, it is a tangible result of the intensive pressures being put on at the present time.

Mr. JONAS. Do I understand you, then, sir, to say that what you are doing is trying to hold down maintenance costs instead of making a study to determine whether our costs are excessive?

Mr. BRYANT. I did not say that. I said we are doing both.

Mr. JONAS. That is what I understood you to say. You are having people turn off lights. That is fine and I am all for it but it is not answering the question as to what is holding up the decision as to whether we are actually spending an unnecessary amount of money on maintenance that we could save if we would contract the work out to private industry, which is anxious and willing and able to do it and has given you a proposition to do it for $35 a month.

Mr. BRYANT. We are identifying just what is covered by that.

Mr. JONAS. You have not seen the proposition?

Mr. BRYANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I have read it for the first time this morning. If you can think of any maintenance which would be required on a house that is not covered, I have not been able to think of it myself. They cover the waterfront.

Mr. BRYANT. That may be true, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Including painting.

Mr. BRYANT. I am trying to determine whether that which remains of the total costs that we are subjected to is greater or less than that which they would perform.

Mr. JONAS. It might interest you to know that a considerable amount of criticism is developing among the taxpayers as a result of these high maintenance costs. So far as I am concerned, I would like to see some progress made and some figures presented showing that we can do this work for less than $35 a month, or I think it ought to be contracted out.

Mr. BRYANT. I agree with you.

Mr. JONAS. Just to do nothing strikes me as not the way to proceed.

Mr. BRYANT. I would agree with that.

Mr. JONAS. Actually, as a matter of fact, is not a lot of maintenance really concealed in base maintenance funds?

Mr. BRYANT. It is possible.

Mr. JONAS. Why would it not be better to put this maintenance item under management rather than base operations?

Mr. BRYANT. I hope I can answer your question categorically in a very limited time. If there is delay I assure you it is not intentional or a matter of forgetfulness on our part.

These are not simple solutions. Feeling as you do, chances are we can show a good operation at a reasonable price through contract operations, it is my effort to try to prove that. If that is so we should utilize it.

Mr. JONAS. What would you say would be a reasonable time to make that study?

Mr. BRYANT. Be as accurate as you can, Mr. Barth, in answering Mr. Jonas' question.

Mr. BARTH. As far as that one company is concerned——

Mr. JONAS. You can forget this company. I do not even know them.

Mr. BARTH. We have just completed a fairly extensive trip to bases with members of the three military departments visiting installations without regard to the service for each to see how the other did the job, just to identify the problems that we have.

I would say we can have a fairly good identification. I don't know about a final decision, that is to go either service contract or military contract, but I think we can have a method of operation in this area in, say 6 weeks.

Mr. BRYANT. I would like to be able to tell the Congressman that it will be my personal effort to conclude this review so that we will have something tangible to talk about within 2 months. I would like to confer with you as to our progress in that period of time.

Mr. JONAS. It would be entirely satisfactory if you just filed a report with the committee.

Mr. BRYANT. All right, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I am not personally interested in this other than as a taxpayer trying to save some money. I have no interest in any company trying to get this business, near or remote.

Mr. BRYANT. This I understand, of course. We have the same objective in mind.

Mr. JONAS. But it does worry me when people call my attention to magazine articles, such as the one I quoted, which say we are stupid

here in Washington, that we insist on wasting money, when money could be saved by being practical and utilizing the services of private concerns which are able to do the work and willing to do it cheaper than we can do it.

When I read such things as that and when they are called to my attention, I do not mind admitting it makes me boil.

Mr. BRYANT. I assure you——

Mr. JONAS. I will do all I can personally to stimulate this effort.

Mr. BRYANT. After all, I feel I have a definite responsibility, obviously. I am sure that these articles have been anything but pleasant reading for me.

Mr. JONAS. Yes. The one I quoted from is not the only one which has been written on the subject.

Mr. BRYANT. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure you have seen the others.

Mr. BRYANT. I have had them all sent to me, whether I asked for them or not.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to establish cost factors will you not have to pull out your public service aspect?

Mr. BRYANT. That is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order to establish the cost factor to which my colleague has been addressing himself, and where you said you would do your best to get it in within a certain time, you have to pull the public utility cost factors away from the situation to establish the maintenance.

Mr. BARTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much, gentlemen. Mr. Secretary you have been most helpful.

Mr. BRYANT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1960.

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY APPROPRIATIONS

WITNESSES

SEYMOUR C. ALENIER, CHIEF, HOUSING MANAGEMENT AND FOREIGN PROGRAMS BRANCH, FAMILY HOUSING DIVISION
H. W. POOLE, OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, COMPTROLLER
ANDREW MAYER, OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. SHEPPARD. The committee will come to order. We will pick up the item dealing with the special foreign currency appropriation.

Do you have a brief statement you want to make, Mr. Alenier?

Mr. ALENIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Please proceed.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. ALENIER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before the committee today on behalf of the De-

partment of Defense to discuss the proposed new "Special foreign currency" appropriation for Department of Defense family housing projects.

Family housing programs of the DOD in oversea areas have in the past been financed primarily from the proceeds of sales of surplus commodities. These sales were authorized pursuant to Public Law 480, 83d Congress, approved July 10, 1954. In enactment of Public Law 480, the Congress declared its policy to be as follows:

> * * * to expand international trade among the United States and friendly nations, to facilitate the convertibility of currency, to promote the economic stability of American agriculture and the national welfare, to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and to stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels, and foreign currencies accepted in payment therefor. It is further the policy to use foreign currencies which accrue to the United States under this act to expand international trade, to encourage economic development, to purchase strategic materials, to pay U.S. obligations abroad, to promote collective strength, and to foster in other ways the foreign policy of the United States * * *.

Title I of this legislation authorized the President to negotiate and carry out agreements to provide for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies; and provided for the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available for sale surplus agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price support operations. Foreign currencies which accrued from agreements with friendly nations were authorized for several purposes, among which was the payment of U.S. obligations abroad. This is a category under which funds were reserved for construction of family housing. Transactions were authorized for these purposes under the basic legislation and amendments thereto until December 31, 1961.

Within 2 months following enactment of this basic legislation, the Congress enacted Public Law 765, 83d Congress (approved September 1, 1954) which provided authorization for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the DOD and their dependents. Section 407 of this law authorized the Secretary of Defense, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing in foreign countries, at a total value of $25 million utilizing foreign currencies generated through Public Law 480. (This amount was subsequently increased to $250 million and the DOD was authorized to expend a maximum of 25 percent appropriated funds for any surplus commodity project.) Under this authority, the DOD was required to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a dollar amount equivalent to the value of the foreign currencies used during any fiscal year. For the purpose of such reimbursement, the DOD was permitted to utilize appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel.

Since enactment of this legislation, the DOD has obtained almost 8,000 units of family housing to meet requirements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the United Kingdom, Spain, Japan, France, Italy, and Morocco. Additional projects have been planned for some of these and other areas as military requirements have developed.

However, in order to finance these additional projects, it is now proposed to request dollar appropriations with which to purchase the required foreign currencies.

The President has proposed that effective July 1, 1960, all foreign currencies available for U.S. agency operations which are received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities be brought under budget and appropriation controls. Such action would provide appropriate review by the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress of operating programs utilizing foreign currencies, bring these currencies under the discipline of the regular budget process, and eliminate "backdoor financing" for such programs. In addition, this procedure would permit review and action by the Congress on an agency program as a whole, rather than merely on the expenditures in U.S. dollars. In his message to the Congress, the President indicated that no further allocations would be made for uncontrolled use after July 1, 1960, except for country grants and loans committed in international agreements. The President further recommended that, at an appropriate time, the Congress remove from the laws the provisions which permit uncontrolled use for other purposes. In line with these recommendations, the President has requested that in future negotiations of international agreements, we endeavor to avoid restrictions which would limit our ability to apply normal budget and appropriation controls to the use of these currencies which are earmarked for U.S. agency operations.

Pursuant to the President's recommendations, the DOD has requested special foreign currency programs for fiscal year 1961 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force to finance the construction of family housing projects and community facilities in several foreign countries. The total DOD program is for $9 million to support a total of 459 family housing units and various community facilities. The program for the Army represents $2 million and supports a prior year's authorization for 114 units of family housing, and a school and commissary in Turkey. The Navy's program covers $3 million and supports 100 units of family housing in Spain and 27 units in Turkey proposed for authorization in the fiscal year 1961 MCA bill. The Air Force program is for $4 million and is in support of 218 units of family housing and community facilities in Japan and Turkey, all of which are also included in the fiscal year 1961 MCA bill.

In addition to the above housing to be built under the special foreign currency program, authorization has been requested in the fiscal year 1961 bill for 1,345 units of family housing to be built in foreign countries under the normal appropriated funds procedure. Included are 675 units for Air Force in Japan, 200 units for Navy in Okinawa, 400 units for Air Force in the Philippines, and 70 units for the Air Force in the United Kingdom. In these countries Public Law 480 currencies are either unavailable, or are not available in sufficient quantity to meet the need.

The DOD has additional valid requirements for several thousand units of family housing at various overseas locations and it is proposed to program this housing on the basis of small annual increments over a period of several years. It is considered advisable to keep family housing construction within modest limitations and continue to review requirements at all locations to insure that the needs remain firm for the foreseeable future.

In the opening portion of my statement I indicated that the DOD has in the past reimbursed the CCC out of forfeited quarters allowances over a period of years for the foreign currencies which have been made available by that agency to the DOD for the construction of military family housing units. Under the proposed new procedure for funding these projects, payment to CCC will be immediate and the deferred payback will no longer be used. Appropriations requested for the DOD in the special foreign currency program will be available only to purchase currencies from the Treasury for family housing programs; the dollar proceeds of such sales would go to the CCC and would reduce the amount of appropriations otherwise required to reimburse the Corporation for its losses.

It is hoped that the information I have provided on present and future overseas family housing programs of the DOD will be of assistance to you in evaluating the appropriations request presently under consideration. Representatives of the three military departments are available to respond to any questions of the committee on overall requirements and specific projects and together with them, I shall be happy to provide whatever additional information you may require.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you.

It is my understanding from your statement that this suggestion emanates from the White House.

Mr. ALENIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And the Bureau of the Budget, I presume, jointly, insofar as that is concerned.

EFFECT OF PROPOSAL ON HOUSING AVAILABILITY

I ask you, what is the attitude of the several services toward the proposal, if you know?

Mr. ALENIER. The attitude of the several services, sir, is that they feel that this program will delay construction of housing which they feel is needed now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What does the Defense Department say?

Mr. ALENIER. We should be able to build as many houses under this proposal as we have built under the previous procedure. The amount of foreign currency available should be the same under any procedure developed.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, if I may clarify that just a little bit more?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. POOLE. Right now we are facing a situation where the available foreign currencies in various countries where we would be interested are not sufficient to take care of all of the U.S. local requirements. Even if this particular budgetary approach to the problem was left the way we used to do it in past years, the number of housing units would depend upon the available foreign currencies. Let us take Western Europe as of right now. We have not enough to take care of all of the requirements and by that I mean the requirements of the whole Government, the day-to-day requirements and everything else. There are not enough surplus commodities so that, let us say, if we had under this appropriation, instead of $9 million

altogether, we had $20 million, it is very doubtful whether we could build any more than under this particular appropriation we are requesting.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Poole, what you are telling the committee is frankly that, insofar as the availability of the funds and the total amount is concerned, the Governmental expenditures as such are over the available funds?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That does not in any manner create a discrimination. You can pick out what you want to the degree that funds are available?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would not slow down the program by your own utilization of what program you wanted to show a preference for?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct, sir.

As stated in Mr. Alenier's statement, in the past, and within the agreements, you more or less earmarked a certain amount of those available foreign currencies for housing or for other things. Under the new policy of the executive department you will earmark for certain things like common defense and so forth, but the rest of it will be available for whatever the United States needs it. If we need it for operations and maintenance, the operations and maintenance man will go and buy foreign currencies. If he needs it for housing, he will buy it for housing, but it is not earmarked for specific purposes in the agreements.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your word "available" is all right and it is an interesting one because I think we all thoroughly understand it. I am sure that you people realize that the Bureau of the Budget is controlling the defense program through expenditure limitations.

I ask you this queston: Will these dollars come under the same limitations or are there specialized considerations by the Bureau of the Budget insofar as the allocation of funds is concerned?

Mr. POOLE. As far as expenditures are concerned, they will come in under the Department of Defense expenditures.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the same controllable category?

Mr. POOLE. The same as any other appropriations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In effect, this places funds for the purchase of foreign currencies in direct competition with funds for essential operational requirements, such as missiles, aircraft, nuclear submarines, and so forth.

What effect do you think this will have on the amount available to purchase those funds as compared to the former method of operation?

Mr. POOLE. I would say they will have to compete much more under the present system than they would have under the past.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From a practical standpoint, when was the new plan made effective?

Mr. POOLE. In considering the 1961 budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You referred to the 1961 budget, but what about the last half of the present year?

Mr. POOLE. May I say something off the record?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. On the record.

Mr. POOLE. I want to be very frank with the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are dealing with the practical operations of the Government and the committee is entitled to have this information. You have the right of selection of words. That is your privilege and I would not quarrel with you on that, but I will repeat the question on the record and I want your answer. Select the phraseology you want to apply.

Mr. POOLE. There are several other programs authorized which we believed we could finance with available foreign currencies as of right now. We asked for allocations for some of those currencies and the Bureau of the Budget informed us that the policy has been established not to allocate any further foreign currencies for family housing, beginning January 1, 1960, because in their opinion they could not be obligated and expended before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What effect does that have on your already established projection, planning, and so forth? In other words, it is my understanding and information that has been presented to this committee previously relative to the preplanning and so forth, that we have some expenditures in that field. Obviously, if the method or procedure that has been announced by the Bureau of the Budget, to which you have just referred and about which you informed the committee, is effective there is a considerable number of those expenditures that might be wasted.

When are we going to realize any benefit out of them, if ever?

Mr. POOLE. I would say, Mr. Chairman, the Bureau's policy affects us directly in one or two countries. One that comes to mind right off hand is Japan. If the policy had not been changed we would have gotten allocations and intitiate construction with available foreign currencies right now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You would have done that because you have already expended funds and put yourself in a position to pursue that course; is that true?

Mr. POOLE. That is true.

Another example is Turkey. I am not inferring that we would have gotten all that we had need of, but there are some currencies available right now. We have other requirements in certain other countries but inasmuch as the currencies are not available, whether there is a policy or no policy, it would not have helped us. In those two cases, I would say that whatever funds we spent preparing for construction, to implement that preparation, we will have to wait until sometime in 1962.

Again, depending on available currencies we can buy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the moment.

Mr. POOLE. I meant 1962, or 1963.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have no way of assuring the committee even in that period of time that the Bureau of the Budget would have any different attitude insofar as releasing funds is concerned, as contrasted to what presently prevails?

Mr. POOLE. No, sir. We will apply or ask the Congress to appropriate funds to buy them under the new procedures.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, the obvious functional requirements as you have expressed them here, and quite apropos, is based

upon the fact that if we have any hiatus or holdbacks, or retardations, or so forth, then you can go to the Congress and get direct appropriated funds and take care of it that way.

That is very clearly indicated whether you wish to express it that way or not.

Is that the fact?

Mr. POOLE. It is a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From a practical standpoint, do you feel that the new method will increase or decrease the disposal of surplus commodities insofar as you know in that field of operation?

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Chairman, I am not the expert on that field, but in our discussions I have come to the conclusion—and this is just a personal opinion I am going to express here—if we take Western Europe as a whole, they say that their currencies have gotten to a point right now where they are not interested any more in these transactions. The United Kingdom will pay in dollars. France will pay in dollars. Germany will pay in dollars, so that as far as agricultural commodities are concerned, if they want them, they can pay for them.

In certain other areas of the world, the so-called underdeveloped areas, the problem is still with us. In other words, whatever we sell to those countries, we will have to accept their own currencies in payment, but as far as the Department of Defense is concerned, that does not help us very much because we have no requirements in some of those countries.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Summing it all up and being as brief as I can about the issues, as I see them, I want to see whether you are in accord with my conclusions or not.

The application of the proposed new method is going to be more retarding than it is expediting?

Mr. POOLE. Let me answer that this way: If we have all the dollars we need under this special appropriation, I do not believe it would be retarding. If we do not have enough, and if we have to ask for appropriations based on available currencies, then I would say it will be regarding somewhat.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To look at the possible operations, you never had all of the money you required and needed, have you, under the budgetary concepts presently you are living under?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If you are to take the problem of the past, which you have dealt with, and bring it up to the present, and apply it upon the basis of experience, your answer obviously would have to be that it would have a retarding effect?

Mr. POOLE. It would be retarded this way: Allocations can be made as funds become available. This kind of funds, that is, whereas under appropriations we come here once a year and from that point of view there will be a certain amount of retarding.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That answer is predicated upon the basis of whether the funds are released at the time you make a request for them?

Mr. POOLE. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Again, it goes back to one basic thing; the control of this whole operation is vested in the Bureau of the Budget; is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. POOLE. Yes, that is correct.
Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions on this item, the gentlemen on my left?
Mr. SIKES. No questions.

NEED FOR TIMELY REIMBURSMENT TO COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as you know I worked with this problem a little more closely by reason of the fact that I was chairman of the subcommittee handling agricultural appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is a little misunderstanding here insofar as the testimony is concerned as it stands now. In the first place as I recall it, Public Law 480 providing for the sale of surplus commodities requires, first, that the country does not get the dollars to buy. Secondly, that the amount sold for foreign currencies must be in addition to normal sales for dollars. That is in the basic act which means that since Western Europe has gotton into a prosperous condition it is extremely difficult to show that any Public Law 480 sales would be in addition to normal sales or that those countries cannot pay dollars.

It means that you do not now have the generation of any currencies, other than what you have described.

Whether we handle the currencies after we get them through this means or other means, I cannot see where it has a thing to do with the removal of the commodities. What you do with your currencies does not enter into that situation. What we may do with currencies after we get them, that is handled under the basic law. Prior to this means, it is true that the military department did not have to go through the appropriating process for dollars to use the currencies, but I would like to point out for the record that where the Department comes in to ask for dollars now to buy these currencies, those dollars, in turn, are turned into the Commodity Credit Corporation, a part of the Government. So while it is a charge against your appropriation, it is a credit to another appropriation.

In other words, it is a bookkeeping transaction insofar as the Government is concerned. Since it is a bookkeeping transaction, I cannot see that if you had use for the currencies and if they were available, if we increased this appropriation to any amount, it would be taking it out of the one pocket and putting it into another pocket. I cannot conceive of the Bureau of the Budget holding them for any use for which they may sell these currencies. If they approve your getting dollars, you then take the dollars and give them to the Commodity Credit Corporation so the Government as a whole is in the same situation.

You mentioned Japan and the use of these currencies. I can see that in the overall Government, you may be competing with the State Department, the Commerce Department, or some other governmental department which could make the best use of available currencies, but I just cannot see that your answer completely shows the story. Again, can you tell us where you could use more currencies if you had the dollars? I do not see any holdback on providing the dollars since we do provide them and they are listed here and credited, so we have not done anything except to approve your use of them.

Did the Bureau of the Budget or the Department of Defense or anybody turn down a request on your part for more money than is

in here, or for more currencies than you can get with dollars? Has any of that happened? I want to know because we do not want this to retard the use of currencies in the least. I do not think it has.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Whitten, perhaps I did not make myself clear. As far as the 1961 appropriation request is concerned, the Bureau of the Budget has approved whatever we recommended. What the Bureau did not allocate to us was this current fiscal year. In other words, under the old procedures we asked for allocations in one or two cases and we were not allocated the available funds. As far as 1961 is concerned, the Bureau has approved the amounts we requested.

Mr. WHITTEN. Did you go ahead in your preparation for 1961 and enlarge your requests to include these things you would like to do in the 6 months but they held that you could not get them obligated and tie them down and use them, in effect?

You could not do that since January 1 or July 1, and I believe you testified as to this holdback on the grounds you could not commit them in that period anyway?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Did you carry forward in your request for 1961 these funds you thought you might have used in the 6 months? Are they included in what is before us?

Mr. POOLE. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. What would it take to do that? Will 1961 meet that need or do you have a need now that will not be met?

Mr. POOLE. It will mean that we will consider them in 1962.

The Chairman, Mr. Whitten, asked me whether in future appropriations the dollars for these will compete with the dollars for something else and my answer to that was "Yes."

Mr. WHITTEN. I know that. That is a matter of judgment and you are entitled to your opinion and you may be right. On the other hand, I cannot see that it should be a case where other dollars you are requesting, which is money out of the Treasury and which, in turn, is spent and gone, but in this you are asking for money out of the Treasury to use some currencies that we could and should use. Here the dollars go right back into the Treasury through the Commodity Credit Corporation. I cannot see for the life of me how a Budget Bureau, or anyone else, could say that a dollar, in that case turned back to the Treasury through the Commodity Credit Corporation, would in anyway compete with the dollars that you want and spent and which is gone. You may be right but I do not think this should be done.

Mr. POOLE. The Bureau of the Budget will not object. This is the point with us: The Chairman asked me if this was within the total, and my answer was "Yes." Now, if we put something else in the total, we have to take something out. As far as the total Federal budget of $80 billion is concerned, there is no change whatsoever. It is just a bookkeeping transaction and you subtract it here and add it there, or vice versa. Within our own part, there is a definite difference.

Mr. WHITTEN. You mean Defense's figure, overall, is inclusive of this?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will, but I would like to follow with this one statement: It leaves it where, for the overall good, the budget should put a ceiling on the overall dollars for general use and this use should be in

addition and extra, separated from any budget ceiling you might have in your overall dollar figure. That is beyond your control perhaps but it does strike me that that is the way it should be handled.

I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Even though the dollar-exchange aspect in going from one pocket to another is involved, which the gentleman from Mississippi has referred to, as being correct, I have no argument with that, but it does place within the Bureau of the Budget more control than presently prevails?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And takes the control out of the hands it presently is in; is that right or wrong?

Mr. POOLE. I am afraid that I can——

Mr. SHEPPARD. You prefer not to answer the question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would say something there. The Budget Bureau can send recommendations down to us, but the Congress determines the final action. The Budget Bureau may try to do so, but they cannot do it unless Congress agrees with them. That is within our control.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Once the funds are purchased, upon the premise of this approach, and go into the control of the Budget Bureau, then where do you have control?

Mr. WHITTEN. You mean the Congress?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Just like the rest of this bill, we can write it like we want to. As I say, be that as it may, I do think that foreign currencies lying around as we have had them without being submitted to the Appropriations Committee of the Congress or without going to the Government itself to determine whether they are to be best used by the military for houses, or best used to support our State Department, or promote foreign markets or agriculture, I do think it is sound business to have a system whereby the Congress has a look at this. I say that Congress presently has had little to do with foreign currencies up to the present moment, in that we do not follow a budgeting type process.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman will recall, I think every item has been submitted to the Congress for its approval.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not wish to differ, but I think it has been demonstrated that an investigation of Public Law 480 shows that many of the currencies have been used on occasion.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was referring to the housing aspects of it.

Mr. WHITTEN. In housing that is certainly true, but it does give the Government an overall look as to where the best use can be made. I have seen uses I have differed with, and did not approve of, but I think somebody needs to look at how we use these currencies.

In the Congress we are entitled to change our minds about it, redirect it, and do all of that, and add to, if we wish.

For the record, I am trying to compare this approach to the other. I have read this investigation of housing purchases in France, and it develops over there that the Commodity Credit Corporation went into that operation and in that particular instance the CCC was willing to provide this grain to France and to take payment by the military of quarters allowances which would be used to pay out for losses to the CCC. According to the report, that shows that instead of paying in francs as the agreement said, somebody over there, without

ever reporting it elsewhere, changed it to dollars where the CCC came out holding the bag in the total amount.

Mr. Chairman, it also shows that the military took out 35 percent of the total quarters allowance claiming it was upkeep on new buildings. It further shows that in that type of operation, the CCC had over the period of the life of that contract to pay out $14 million in interest to the Treasury, but the military will not pay it to the CCC. Before we compare these things, we might go and see how the CCC came out in some of these things with the Defense Department. This I believe was a barter transaction.

Are you familiar with that story, Mr. Poole?

Mr. POOLE. I am not, Mr. Whitten; I know something about the arrangement. It was not an item strictly under the budget end of this business. That project was one where there was no allocation and no apportionment, none of these things. There was an arrangement or barter system, and this is just a conjecture on my part, but there might have been some things not as good as we like them to be. This might have led to these appropriations for available currencies instead of what we did through the other commodity transactions and available surpluses, and that kind of thing. Some people think that by appropriating dollars, when you need these currencies, you pay for them in dollars and there is much more control than under what we did in the past.

That might have had some effect on arriving at this decision.

Mr. WHITTEN. In the agricultural bill, with which I deal directly, the Department of Agriculture is appropriating dollars itself.

They do this to buy currencies and then the dollars go back to Agriculture. That is the Commodity Credit Corporation which is a part of the Department, and there our subcommittee takes the view that since we want these currencies used to the best available purpose you can find, I cannot see any basis for our holding down on any dollars you want for that because if you cannot buy the currencies, your dollars are not usable. I think this certainly should not be competitive in the least with the other part of your budget where you get a dollar, spend it, and it is gone. That is a matter of opinion, however, but that is the attitude taken by the other committee.

Mr. POOLE. In the overall Federal budget, you are absolutely 100 percent right. As I say, we still are talking about whether we pay for it or someone else pays for it, but in the overall, it does not make any difference.

There is one other point I am sure you are aware of. In our normal military construction we have to get authorization first and then ask for dollars later. Even by changing this number here that you asked me a little while ago about, we raise this number from $9 million to $15 million, we have to get authorization for the additional. These are present authorizations.

Mr. WHITTEN. I still think that if the Congress through the appropriating process appropriated dollars for general use, which you have had for that work, whether Congress should or not appropriate, it is up to them and up to the showing that you make.

I guess that in Japan there is a lot of competition between the various Departments of the Government as to which one gets its hands on it to use for that purpose. It that true?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct. There is something else I should like to mention. This committee last year gave us a general provision which said that whatever we might build in a foreign country, the first thing we have to do is to try to use the available foreign currencies or certify why we did not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You had no problem with that?

Mr. POOLE. None

Mr. WHITTEN. I may have not done too good a job, but I have tried to put in the record the various ramifications on this. I may be in error but I thought we should show that aspect of this.

That is all I have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions, the gentleman on my left?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your appearance, gentlemen.

Mr. POOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Alenier, it is a pleasure to see you here and I hope we get better acquainted.

Mr. ALENIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1960.

CHANGES IN DEFENSE PROGRAM

WITNESSES

FRANKLIN B. LINCOLN, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)

HARRY W. POOLE, HEAD, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BRANCH, DEPUTY COMPTROLLER FOR BUDGET, OFFICE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)

MAJ. GEN. R. J. FRIEDMAN, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET, COMPTROLLER

EFFECT OF CANCELLATION OF BOMARC

Mr. SHEPPARD. Gentlemen, we have with us this morning Mr. Lincoln, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), and we want to discuss BOMARC and some other issues. So you may tell us the story, will you, please?

Mr. LINCOLN. Yes, sir.

Perhaps I should refer to the letter from Mr. Gates to you, Mr. Chairman, dated April 13, 1960. Is that in the record, sir?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. LINCOLN. This letter, as you know, referred to certain deletions or reductions from the Air Force program and the addition of certain other items. With particular reference to BOMARC, the letter of April 13, to which I refer, involved a partial cutback of that program. Mr. Chairman, you have asked us to state briefly what the results would be if BOMARC were completely canceled. There are eight bases at which construction is involved: McGuire, Suffolk, Otis, Dow, Langley (where there are two sites), Kinchloe, Duluth, and Niagara.

The McGuire, Suffolk, Otis, Dow, and Langley site No. 1 have been completed as BOMARC A sites and no recoupments are possible. At Langley No. 2, Kinchloe, Duluth, and Niagara, the Air Force estimated as of April 1, 1960, recoupments of approximately $2.2 million could be made if these sites were canceled as of that date.

In general the recoupments would depend on the date of the cancellation and the agreement which could be made with the contractor. I have attempted to get the best figure possible, but our people tell us it is pretty much a question of how soon we cancel, because these are fast-spending projects. The contractors are building on a large scale and are pressing ahead. Our people say if we do not cancel within the next 2 or 3 months, we probably will not be able to recoup more than $200,000 or $300,000. These figures, of course, are subject to check and would be subject to negotiating with the contractor. It would have to be a prompt cancellation if we are to save that $2.2 million which the Air Force tells us they could save if it were done promptly, for example today.

That is the sum and substance of the BOMARC cancellation as I understand it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the length of time which is necessary actually to stop further procedure under the contracts once the decision has been made?

Mr. LINCOLN. I think that is just a matter of sending out a telegram and stopping the work, once the Secretary has decided that this should be done and the Congress has indicated that is what they want done.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the present position of the Secretary of Defense is that we should proceed on the reduced BOMARC program, and it was on that basis he wrote you the letter of April 13. So I am not prepared to say whether the Secretary would agree to cancel the BOMARC as of today's date. We would have to consider the matter very carefully before we could make a final decision.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as the operation is concerned on the congressional level, of course, the procedures here are obvious. We all understand them. What will be done will be the result of a conference between the House and the Senate if the Senate does not see fit to accept the House recommendation as that recommendation presently exists. Of course, the bill in itself has not passed the House.

A fact has been brought to my attention which I had momentarily overlooked, that the other day in its testimony the Air Force said it could save about $14 million against what you figure here at the moment as some $2 million.

Mr. LINCOLN. $2.2 million, that is correct, sir.

Mr. POOLE. May I say something? Mr. Lincoln's statement was with respect to the first eight. It is not the total. The $2.2 million is with respect to the sites which he named.

General FRIEDMAN. That is correct. That would be the recoupment. I would like to state that the $14 million figure is high. I talked to Mr. Sufit and to the construction people on this, and they were going to attempt to change that figure. It would be more on the order of $11 million than the $14 million figure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any figure in that respect at the moment would be more or less a hypothetical figure, the very best you could get, because

of the different stages which are involved primarily in the construction; and beyond your construction, at the moment you do not have any commitments other than those you have referred to here. Is that correct?

Mr. LINCOLN. That is correct, sir, but I believe the $14 million figure we are talking about involves all 16 bases.

General FRIEDMAN. Yes, sir; it does. I would say, to make the record clear: If the $2.2 million figure which Mr. Lincoln discusses this morning holds on the basis of an immediate action, then our figure, rather than $14 million, would be on the order of $11½ million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In either event, as I see the total picture, gentlemen, we are still in the position of an undetermined factor. The ultimate answer, as far as I see it presently, would hinge upon whether there was concurrence between the House and the Senate, and then what ultimately happens to the funds. Irrespective of the Presidential aspect or what the Secretary of Defense, the funds will be the controlling factor in the final analysis, as we see the picture.

Mr. LINCOLN. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Operationally speaking, it is just one of those things.

USE OF JOHNSTON ISLAND IN NIKE-ZEUS PROGRAM

I wish you would discuss with us at this time, if you will, Johnston Island and the NIKE-ZEUS program, in order that we might have some up-to-date clarification of the issue, please.

Mr. LINCOLN. I shall be happy to do that, Mr. Chairman.

I spoke to Dr. York late Friday evening in anticipation of my appearance before the committee, to get the latest information. Dr. York says that as far as he knows at the moment, the Johnston Island program will probably be canceled, but no final decision has been made. On the assumption, however, that it is canceled, it would seem to me from my discussions with him that the present amount requested for appropriation for 1961 of $765,000, which is to alter buildings on Johnston Island, would not be necessary. If they decide not to use the Johnston Island site, they will move the operation probably to the west coast. That brings up the question of the $20,500,000 which they still have in the fiscal year 1960 appropriation. It would require reprograming to do that. In addition to that, there are a number of items in the program which they might or might not use. There are some, however, which it is clear they would use. For the information of this committee, I would like just to mention three items.

These are the impact predictor system which is carried at $6,570,000, the interisland communications system at $3,100,000, and instrumentation at $1,230,000. This is a total of roughly $11 million which Dr. York tells me would have to be built at the Pacific Range or wherever they might make this installation, if not at Johnston Island.

As for the balance of the items, some $10 million, it is difficult for me and difficult for Dr. York and, I am sure, the Army, too, and probably for you gentlemen to determine whether all of these facilities will be needed. It would seem to me that a fair disposition of the problem at this moment would be perhaps to preserve $5 million of the $10 million balance to be used, upon notice to the appropriate

committees, for the installation on the west coast, if they decide to go ahead there. Of course, the Army would prefer to retain the entire $10 million. Maybe they should. Maybe it will be necessary to come back later and ask for the balance of $5 million. But trying to be fair to you gentlemen, and having in mind saving as much money as we can, it would be the Comptroller's suggestion that perhaps that would be one way to do it. As I say, in either event it would have to be reprogramed, to preserve the entire $20 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What creates the condition where we cannot make a determination?

Mr. LINCOLN. I do not know. I pressed Dr. York on that point. He said, of course this is one of many problems they have. Apparently the difficulty is that they have not determined where the site will be if it is not at Johnston Island. Some in the Army still want to retain Johnston Island.

I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, and sympathize with the problem of trying to get a decision. I know this is not very much help to this committee at this time, but it is the best I can afford you from what I have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can well understand that. Naturally, I shall not charge you with that responsibility, because I do not think it is yours as such, if I may put it that way, sir, but that does not obviate the fact we have indecision. One branch of the military wants it this way, and another the other way. In the final analysis, somebody has to make up his mind. I am getting fed up with vacillation on these decisions. People who are in the Government exclusively for the purpose of determining what shall be done in the missile field ought to be able to make up their mind, irrespective of what the controversy may be among the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The waste of time here means possible waste of money. If my attitude is wrong that undue expenditures accumulate and are required by indecision, then you gentlemen from the Comptroller's Office go ahead and tell me so, but nobody has been able to prove that to me yet. If you have a new angle to it, I will be most receptive to it.

Mr. LINCOLN. No, Mr. Chairman. However Dr. York has assured me he will make a prompt decision. As I say, I talked to him on Friday.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to be helpful. Dealing up here, as we do, gentlemen, with the taxpayers' money, there must be some place along the line where these decisions must be made by somebody who has the authority imposed upon him by law. I think it should be done.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

Do you have any change in your unobligated balances between previous testimony and the present time?

Mr. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, we do not. I checked that as recently as this morning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are there any questions on the items under discussion, the gentleman on my right?

Mr. WHITTEN. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your presentations this morning. You have been very helpful. I do not want to burden you with the responsibilities of others, because we are in the same position you are.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON MISSILE PROGRAM

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk for a minute to General Friedman, if I may.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Go ahead.

Mr. JONAS. General, the other day when you were last before the committee, you and I had a colloquy about appropriations.

General FRIEDMAN. Yes, sir, I recall.

Mr. JONAS. I have checked the records, and am of the opinion you were talking about fiscal year 1957, and I was talking about calendar year 1957, which dealt with fiscal year appropriations for 1958. Do you come to that same conclusion?

General FRIEDMAN. I came to the same conclusion. I think we both were firm in our own mind as to what we were discussing. Yes, mine was fiscal year 1957. I would like to assure the gentleman that the only reason I was as conversant with 1957 as I was that particular morning, I had been requested to make a study of that particular year by another Congressman. Otherwise, I would have sat here in silence and we would not even have come up with the colloquy. I was talking fiscal year 1957.

Mr. JONAS. I was surprised, because on February 1 when you and Mr. Lincoln and General Traub were before the other committee, a table was furnished to the committee which showed that Air Force funds were cut under the President's budget $541 million for fiscal year 1958, which occurred in calendar year 1957.

General FRIEDMAN. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. Are you familiar with that statement?

General FRIEDMAN. I am aware of it.

Mr. JONAS. You helped prepare it, I assume.

General FRIEDMAN. Yes, sir. I think it is very fortunate we both wound up right.

Mr. JONAS. Of course, Congress did cut the Defense Department budget $2½ billion in calendar year 1957, which applied to fiscal year 1958 funds. Those were the figures I had in mind, and I was surprised when you gave contrary testimony. When I went to the books to check it, I found that I was correct and assumed that you were talking about fiscal year 1957, the bill for which was passed in 1956.

General FRIEDMAN. I must admit you had me rather worried when I left, because I had made, as I said, an investigation of that particular fiscal year. I thought I knew what I was talking about, but you sounded so certain that you rather shook my confidence. As it so turns out, we were talking about different years.

Mr. JONAS. I had examined this table in the hearings before the Mahon committee on February 1, and that is the reason I knew there was a considerable difference in the 2 years.

General FRIEDMAN. Right.

Mr. JONAS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to ask you to come back so you and I could clear up our understanding as to what years we were talking about.

General FRIEDMAN. Thank you.

Mr. LINCOLN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1960.

LANGUAGE CHANGES

WITNESSES

LESTER T. SMITH, OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

HARRY W. POOLE, HEAD, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BRANCH, DEPUTY COMPTROLLER FOR BUDGET, OFFICE, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have with us Mr. Smith and Mr. Poole for the purpose of discussing language changes.

You go right ahead and start out with the first one on page 6, line 22.

Mr. SMITH. Sir, we do not have a committee print such as you have, but I think we can all follow by section and we will be all together. The first language change is in section 101; we do not have any change in the language except as is necessary to include projects authorized in the 2d session of the 86th Congress. This is just a technical amendment.

The next language change is proposed for section 104, in which it is requested that the words "in this act" be stricken and the words "to the Department of Defense" be inserted in lieu thereof.

This identical section has been carried for a number of years in both the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Military Construction Appropriation Act language, and it is proposed to delete the section from the big bill, and broaden the language in this section to bring any money available to the Department of Defense under the limitation. It is thought it is more properly set up in this bill rather than the big bill because of the construction involved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This change, I presume you know, would make this subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; that is so. It is a limitation, however, and to that extent would not be subject to a point of order. Nevertheless, as you say, it refers not only to this act but also another act. I might say the big bill as reported by the House retains this language. They did not strike it. Therefore, the change here becomes academic.

In section 105, we have another change. We have recommended that language for advance planning and outside utilities be deleted as it is no longer necessary since specific citations have been deleted from the language under the Army, Navy, and Air Force headings.

These citations were carried in the general provisions of the construction bill since they were applicable across the board, but since dollars are now proposed to be appropriated for military construction

currently authorized, there is no longer any need for carrying the citations here in the general provisions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, take up the next item.

Mr. SMITH. The next change is in section 109. It is proposed to strike out the language which authorizes us to pay 15 percent higher for NIKE site property. It is not contemplated any more housing will be purchased at NIKE sites. Therefore, it is proposed that the language be deleted from this section.

The next recommended change is in section 113. It is recommended that this section be deleted, since no funds are included in the estimates for this purpose.

New language is proposed as section 113. It would permit transfer of the unexpended balances of amounts made available under the heading "Military construction, foreign countries" to be merged with appropriations to be made available during fiscal year 1961 for military assistance.

In 1953, there was appropriated to the Department of Defense $140 million for the purpose of establishing and developing military installations and facilities in foreign countries. This amount was appropriated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense in the Military Public Works Appropriation Act, 1953. These moneys were fully obligated at that time. It is anticipated that several more years will elapse before this account will be eliminated from the books. It is recommended that language be included which would effectively merge the unexpended balances with military assistance funds appropriated to carry out the purposes authorized by chapter I of the Mutual Security Act, as amended.

The President proposed language for this merger authority when he submitted the request for appropriations for the mutual security program last year. The House Committee on Appropriations failed to include it in the mutual security appropriation bill, since it is understood that it was not made clear at the time hearings were held that this was a bookkeeping or accounting transaction which would merely eliminate this old account. In fact, there are no published hearings on this particular matter.

That covers all of the language changes, Mr. Chairman, which are proposed.

PROPOSED SECTION 113

Mr. SHEPPARD. With further reference to page 12, line 13, which you have discussed, it would occur to the members of the committee that this might be a so-called backdoor approach to adding funds to the foreign aid program. Is that assumption logical as a conclusion, or is it not?

Mr. SMITH. We do not think so, Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the fact that all of the money is obligated. We have multilateral agreements under NATO. This is a matter pertaining to those agreements, and in particular, slice 3. This money has been obligated under slice 3. It could be deobligated. I do not think there is any legal objection to that. However, we would have to raise dollars some way or other to take care of our obligations under slice 3.

As far as the Department is concerned, we consider it nothing more than a bookkeeping entry. Rather than have three or four accounts, it would be combined.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is my understanding that last year you presented this subject matter to the Congress in the foreign aid bill. What happened under that circumstance?

Mr. SMITH. There are no published hearings on it. I understand that it really was not even heard, and that the committee did not understand at that time that it was merely a bookkeeping entry. Further than that, I cannot give you any information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The funds could be rescinded if it were so desired, could they not?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir, they could be deobligated, but then we would be faced with picking up our obligations under slice 3 with other money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish you would provide at this time for the record the expenditure figures for each of the past 5 years under this account, will you, please?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. I have them here, Mr. Chairman.

In 1953, approximately a half million dollars was expended.

In 1954, $31,900,000.

In 1955, $29,920,000.

In 1956, $15,085,000.

In 1957, $6,481,000.

In 1958, $6,616,000.

In 1959, $6,639,000.

It is anticipated that we will be spending around $6 million or $7 million a year until the money is gone. Today, as of April 1, 1960, there was an unexpended amount of some $37,151,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have some further questions having to do with sections that we pushed aside. As long as we are on page 12, having to do with section 113, are there any questions you would be interested in presenting on this item at this time?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to ask this: Just what is the meaning of "unexpended balance"? Just what is the meaning of this language insofar as the liberty that you gain in the use of these funds? Have these been justified project by project where you carry them forward so they will be available for new projects? Just how does that work?

Mr. POOLE. This represents the estimated required contribution of the United States in that particular slice. There were no project-by-project justifications to the Congress. This was just an estimate of the U.S. contribution of the infrastructure. The annual appropriation for infrastructure now is carried in the aid program. There is no project-by-project justification. It is just the estimate of the U.S. contribution. This particular construction you might say differs from our regular construction appropriation and program.

(Off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Pursuing this thing further, I refer to the laxity which many folks think we have in this whole foreign aid program, and the interchangeability between whether something is military aid or foreign aid and the ability to change the title at the top so as to justify the actions taken thereafter. If we follow this course of each year letting you carry over unexpended balances and if we continue through the other bill to appropriate more than we will be using, presumably, over a 10-year period, if you carry forward everything, you end up with a tremendous amount of money on hand, and then you

tell us there is no real tiedown, project by project. So we are just giving you an open account, continuing to add to the kitty, without any justification. I do not mean you do not have justifications for your expenditures, but I mean it is done without following the course of justifying to the Congress through the normal procedure.

It is my thought that somewhere along the line we should get detailed information. How did you get the money? How much did you use? How much do you have left? What do you mean to do with it for the future? We just come in contact with this in a minor way, moneywise. This is just asking us to sign a blank check to you, not only for the future but for everything you have had in the past.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Whitten, let me take a moment to go back a little bit on this, although it is not part of the regular "Military construction" appropriation.

The NATO people approve a program of, let us say, $100 million. When this program goes to the appropriate committee of NATO which investigates and approves construction, they have a list of items in all the 15 or 16 countries. Then they approve, as I said, $100 million. Our share of that is a U.S. commitment and agreement that we will pay, of that total, anywhere from 37 to 48 percent. Our percentage changes annually by agreement. So actually no one can say that of the 48 percent, and if it is $100 million, let us say, $48 million, so much will go for this project or that project. It is 48 percent of the total estimate of that program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I follow you there, Mr. Poole, but if we let you carry forward these amounts, if we let them build up, for instance, to where you have a billion dollars in the kitty, we are likely to agree to a 46-percent contribution, as you describe it, but on the other hand it may be 50 percent. The bigger the amount of money you have in your hands, the greater the demand that we put up a bigger percentage instead of a smaller percentage; that is, if human nature works in that area as it does everywhere else.

Since you will have new money and since it will be justified in the other bill for the use you described, would we not be much wiser to let the existing money lapse and let you look for new money for whatever develops?

Mr. SMITH. Of course, this money would not lapse, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be tied down to particulfar purposes?

Mr. SMITH. It is completely obligated, but for expenditure purposes it remains available for expenditure.

Mr. WHITTEN. You say it would not lapse. Under this course you follow, where you have a kitty to meet agreements as they develop and you do not justify this project by project, how is it tied to projects? Could we have a list of those projects? You say it is already committed, so it must be committed to something.

Mr. POOLE. It is committed against a total.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is committed against a total?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct. In other words, if the infrastructure program for a particular year is $100 million and our agreement is that of that $100 million we will pay 37 or 40 percent, that is what we pay.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, it occurs to me that somewhere in this procedure there is at least some

kind of foreordained concept as to why you need $100 million. It is there, if it is made available, to be utilized on a graduated scale of Federal Government expenditure as the counterpart of another country's contribution.

I can well understand what Mr. Whitten has developed: that there are many unknown factors in here, but somewhere along the line somebody reached the figure of the hypothetical $100 million, they themselves not knowing whether they were going to participate 10 percent or 14 percent or X percent at that time, because that is determined, as I interpreted your comments, at the time the project goes into effect, not prior thereto. Is that not correct?

Mr. POOLE. There are two determinations, Mr. Chairman. First, if we go back to the beginning—the conceived program of construction to support NATO runs close to a billion pounds. Of course, nobody could afford that kind of thing, and they scaled it down. Later on, the estimate was revised several times. They decided they would pick it up in various increments or slices. This I would like to leave off the record.

(Off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Pursuing this a little further, you come up with a language change without any testimony as to what is involved. I wonder if it would be appropriate to say how much money you had for this use last year; how much of it has been expended; how much of it is left; and how much of that which is left is committed. Then, if you could give us that information, I would like to see the effect of taking funds which are committed and identified and merging them with a new appropriation which has no strings on it, you might say, or only a few strings, if any. Unless we know how much of this you have, how much has been committed and for what purpose, how much is left, and if it is left for that purpose, does it mean you are quitting that purpose? Or are you doing like the rest of the foreign aid—bringing forward everything into an open kitty to do with as you please?

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Whitten, this was one appropriation for one year. After 1953, whatever money we needed for infrastructure is in the aid program. In other words, this was just one year, one appropriation for 1953.

Mr. JONAS. $140 million.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JONAS. I have the language—$140 million in one appropriation in fiscal year 1954.

Mr. SMITH. It was approved July 15, 1953.

Mr. POOLE. So every year within the total of the aid program, there is money for construction, but it is not under this appropriation. This was a one-shot proposition. After that, the funds for construction to support NATO have been part of the aid program. So, if we transfer this and merge it, there will be one appropriation to support NATO. All we say is: As long as we have one appropriation which will do it, why carry another appropriation on the books—for the next 5 or 6 or 7 years, it may spend very slowly? Nobody will save any money. This will eliminate four sets of books—one in Europe, one in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, one in the Bureau of the Budget, and one in the Treasury. As long as this has not been spent, we have to keep the books open until it is spent.

Outside of that, we shall not accomplish anything. We will not save any money, except the administrative expense. That is all.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is an annual one. Do you not think they could at least do some planning? Now they are handling it differently, and they are meeting the issue every year. If we are doing that, is it not better to do some really good Government bookkeeping by recapturing the balances which are in this old fund, and meet it every year and justify it? The world is changing. NATO changes. Our support has not changed. Would it not be better for us to recapture these funds and let you straighten your books out in line with your present approach to it—that is, on an annual basis?

Mr. POOLE. I wonder, though, in fact, if that is not what we are doing.

Mr. WHITTEN. You bring these unexpended balances over into this year's availability, and this year you have justified what you needed, and presumably you are getting the funds in this year's bill. Did you justify what you had based on holding onto these funds, or did you meet it head on?

Mr. POOLE. No, sir. The annual appropriations for infrastructure are on their own, and do not take this into consideration.

Mr. WHITTEN. So you have just this much extra. You have it now. You did not say anything about it, presumably, in the request this year, because you asked for all that you could see you needed. So if this is carried forward, you just have this much in addition to whatever you said you needed in the request before the other subcommittee for mutual security.

Mr. POOLE. If this thing here were just like our military construction program, I would say that is perfectly correct. But, as I said before, it is not. It is a sort of mongrel affair.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have a whole lot of mongrel affairs in government. If we could get away from that attitude, we might do a better job. How much money is involved in this as of now?

Mr. POOLE. $37 million obligated.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do we have a list of where it has been obligated?

Mr. POOLE. No.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is that supersecret?

Mr. POOLE. It is not the security. It is obligated for infrastructure for NATO.

Mr. SMITH. It is specifically obligated for slice 3; slice 3 was being considered back in 1953.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is committed.

Mr. SMITH. That is right, sir. Insofar as the U.S. portion of the contribution to NATO's plan for that year, it was committed right then and there. We asked for it at that time.

Mr. WHITTEN. What has happened to it since 1953? Has it been drawn against or has it just stayed there dormant?

Mr. SMITH. Every year they have spent money. In fact, I read into the record a little while ago the amount of money that was expended down through the years.

Mr. POOLE. Mr. Whitten, someone can tell you what they spent the $6,639,000 project by project, but they cannot say what they are going to spend the $37 million for.

Mr. WHITTEN. What year, now?

Mr. POOLE. 1959, for instance, where we have the data we paid out $6.6 million, they can tell you where they paid it and for what. But what they are going to pay the $37 million for, they cannot tell you in the same detail.

Mr. WHITTEN. $37 million?

Mr. POOLE. Yes; the unexpended.

Mr. WHITTEN. Are the funds that you have, with which you would merge the $37 million, for the same general purpose?

Mr. POOLE. Yes, sir; supporting NATO construction.

Mr. WHITTEN. Are they justified in meeting the overall needs, including whatever commitments were made back in 1953 or 1959?

Mr. POOLE. I do not know.

Mr. WHITTEN. I understood you to say that in your justifications for the mutual security fund you did not call attention to the $37 million; that you submitted everything that you could foresee that you would need. It strikes me if you give this $37 million and bring it forward, you will have $37 million more available in a fund that itself was made big enough to meet your obligations to NATO. Perhaps I do not understand it, but that is the way it appears to me.

Mr. SMITH. When they justify the mutual security program, infrastructure particularly——

Mr. WHITTEN. What do you mean by that?

Mr. POOLE. Infrastructure is a term we use for construction to support NATO requirements.

Mr. SMITH. Each year they have a new program. Each year when they come up with this program they refer to the program as a slice.

At the present time they are working on slice No. 11. When this number was justified back in 1952 they were working on slices 2 and 3. Slice 2, as I understand it, has gone by the board but slice 3 is still not completely taken care of. That is where this money is committed. It is obligated and if we did not have the dollars they would just have to ask for that much more for infrastructure in order to take care of our NATO commitments across the board.

As I understand it, NATO construction is a lot slower than other types of construction by virtue of the fact that you have a number of countries involved and it just takes that much longer to get them together to decide what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. Actually, and in fact, all we are asking for is that this money be put in with all the rest of the money for infrastructure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any authority under law for this suggestion?

Mr. SMITH. I did not understand the question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have authority in law for this proposed change?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; to the extent that we have multilateral agreements in our NATO authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have a transfer requirement definitely set forth.

Mr. SMITH. No; this would be the authority to transfer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Have you made a research of the Mutual Security Act to the degree that you are sure you have enough authority to accomplish what you are suggesting here?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; there is authority.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do you have any questions on this particular item?

Mr. JONAS. Yes; just one or two.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

Mr. JONAS. As I understand it, you have about $37 million left in this $140 million item.

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. You cannot tell us what it is to be spent for because NATO will decide that, is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. It is committed.

Mr. JONAS. It is committed to NATO?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. It is not committed to specific items?

Mr. SMITH. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. You cannot tell in advance what it will be spent for because that decision will be made by the NATO people?

Mr. SMITH. That is right, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Does that same situation apply with respect to infrastructure funds in the Mutual Security Act or do we control the disposition of those funds?

Mr. SMITH. It is the same situation. Each year we go up and ask for authority under the Mutual Security Act for dollars for infrastructure which represents the U.S. contribution.

Mr. JONAS. That is a lump sum transfer to the NATO authorities?

Mr. SMITH. It is a lump sum authority to which money is appropriated.

Mr. JONAS. All I want to know is whether what you propose to do here with this $37 million is different than the way we handle the funds for infrastructure in the Mutual Security Act.

Mr. SMITH. There is no difference whatsoever, sir. It just so happens that these particular dollars for infrastructure were appropriated outside of the mutual security system and so all we are trying to do is put them together so that there won't be any difference whatsoever insofar as the books are concerned.

Mr. JONAS. I understand.

Mr. SMITH. It is just that we had some moneys appropriated for this purpose in two different accounts and we want to put them together.

Mr. JONAS. Following up Mr. Whitten's questions, the net result of this would be that in addition to whatever funds are appropriated for fiscal year 1961 in the Mutual Security Act, will be augmented by this $37 million?

Mr. SMITH. No, sir; if we do not have this language, we will still have the $37 million except that we will keep it in this account rather than put it in with mutual security dollars.

Mr. JONAS. Nevertheless, I am still correct in what I said, am I not, that whatever funds we appropriate this year for use in 1961 for infrastructure under the Mutual Security Act, there will be added to those funds this $37 million?

Mr. SMITH. These would be merged with them, there is no doubt about that, sir.

Mr. JONAS. That is right. It will be additional dollars.

Mr. SMITH. Not any more than what we have available to us today.

Mr. JONAS. I understand, but if you were considering only the Mutual Security Act, it would be in addition to that?

Mr. SMITH. This is correct.

Mr. JONAS. It was previously appropriated. We understand.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will you yield?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. So far as I have been able to understand this, we should either go along and let you merge it, or the Congress should recapture it, depending on whether your current money is sufficient to meet your overall obligations to NATO, and if your current bill has ample funds to meet the overall needs. What you would need to do would be to recapture this $37 million.

Mr. SMITH. There is only one comment that I can make on that and that is if we recaptured the money, in other words, we took it off the books completely, it would just mean that the dollars that we need for infrastructure, this year or next year as the case may be, whenever it would happen, would have to be increased in that amount because we still have the obligation to meet.

Mr. WHITTEN. This was not a part of the justification in the present year's mutual security budget?

Mr. SMITH. That is right. This has been carried separately.

Mr. WHITTEN. Have you called attention to it each year?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir. In the hearings this is always pointed out; when they talk about our unexpended balance in mutual security dollars carried forward this is always set out as a footnote that we have this $140 million of which so much money is still unexpended. It is handled separately by virtue of the fact that it just originated in a different piece of paper.

Mr. WHITTEN. No further questions. Thank you.

Mr. JONAS. I have no further questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Sanders, our staff assistant and I have been discussing this thing and still in my mind and to a degree in Mr. Sanders' mind we need clarification. Would you inquire into the particular aspect we were discussing, Mr. Sanders?

Mr. SANDERS. If you transfer this to military assistance, can't you then administratively deobligate it and technically use the funds for other military assistance projects?

Mr. SMITH. As a matter of law, you can do that.

Mr. SANDERS. So you are actually increasing the military assistance program by this transfer?

Mr. POOLE. That is correct.

Mr. SANDERS. Legally?

Mr. SMITH. As a matter of law, that is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. In line with what Mr. Sanders raised, the effect of this is to get rid of any strings that were tied in on it in the original act?

Mr. SMITH. That is not our intent.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say the effect.

Mr. SMITH. This could happen.

Mr. WHITTEN. It has that effect?

Mr. SMITH. That is right, sir.

Mr. POOLE. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen. Let's revert to page 6, line 22, having to do with military construction and the special foreign currency program as such. What specific authority in law do you have for the purchase of foreign currencies as contemplated by the proposal, "Foreign currency program" that we just referred to?

Mr. SMITH. We have authority in Public Law 765, of the 83d Congress, in section 407 to utilize foreign currencies for the purchase of housing. This language would provide the dollars to buy the foreign currencies authorized to be used under 407.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why can't this be a single appropriation to the Department of Defense rather than the three separate items to the services as such?

Mr. SMITH. It could be. I do not think there is any question insofar as the law is concerned. Is there any reason why you would not want that, Mr. Poole?

Mr. POOLE. Well, administratively it can be. We will have to be the judges to split the total amount, which at times becomes a little complicated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You mean complicated mathematically or complicated psychologically?

Mr. POOLE. Well, Mr. Chairman, let's say I can forsee that one of the services will come in and ask for the $9 million immediately and we have to be the people to turn them down.

PROPOSED SECTION 105 OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let's pick up the next item that we have under consideration, and that is on page 9, line 21: What specific actions have you taken under section 105 and part II that you refer to here? What is the situation on that issue?

Mr. SMITH. This particular section, sir, authorizes us—well, section 407 that I just mentioned gives us authority to use foreign currencies for building houses. These foreign currencies were to be generated under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Subsection 407(b) authorizes us to supplement the foreign currencies with dollars but by an amount of not more than 25 percent of the total cost of each project.

We are now asking, as you see from the language that we were just discussing a moment ago, for dollars to purchase foreign currencies. The use of those dollars will be for the use of purchasing only foreign currencies that were generated under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. This language will give us broader authority to add up to 25 percent of the cost of the project in dollars. We do understand that under section 113 of the Military Construction Appropriation Act we have got to either buy foreign currencies or certify that they are not available, but this language will give us a little broader authority than we have without it.

I understand that the Navy has a request for dollars for this purpose in this year's bill. Is this right, Mr. Poole?

Mr. POOLE. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. By following this procedure, what do you gain by it? Do you expedite the procedure? Do you have money by the procedure or is it just a desirable thing from a bookkeeping point of view?

Mr. SMITH. You are referring to the request for dollars for foreign currencies?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right. We discussed it quite extensively.

Mr. SMITH. This procedure will give greater control over the budget.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Who will have the control, the Congress or Department of Defense, or the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. SMITH. The Congress certainly will, by virtue of the fact that today we have blanket authority under 407 to use foreign currencies. Here we have to tell you what the program is going to be and ask for the dollars in order to reimburse the Department of Agriculture. Under 407, as you know, we reimburse the Department of Agriculture for the foreign currencies used over a period of years out of pay and allowances. Under this latest procedure we pay for them immediately.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right.

Let's go to page 11, line 5, if you will.

NEED FOR EXEMPTION FROM LIMITATION ON CERTAIN HOUSING

Why is it necessary to continue the exemption for the family housing unit cost at West Point? What particular approach do we have here? This is somewhat an exception to the rule as far as requests are concerned. What particular requirement is so evident that a request of this character seems to be necessary?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, when the budget went to print, the 156 units authorized last year were not under contract. In fact, I understand that the contract was entered into in January of this year. I understand that there might be some additional expenses that could be chargeable to these dollars. Maybe Mr. Poole can help us out on that.

Mr. POOLE. Although the contracts shown now or when they received the bid are slightly less than the amount that the Congress appropriated last year, those houses are not completed and they will not be completed until sometime late in 1961. As long as there is work going on, new obligations can be made, not only just the original contract, but additional obligations for contract changes and all that kind of thing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, questions on the item?

Mr. SIKES. No questions.

Mr. WHITTEN. No questions.

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

The committee will stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1960.

POLLUTION OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY

WITNESS

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right, gentlemen, the committee will come to order. We have with us this morning the Honorable John F. Baldwin, representing the bay district of California. He has a statement he wishes to make to the committee and for the purpose of the record, is that right, Mr. Baldwin?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are most welcome. Proceed with your statement, please.

Mr. BALDWIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to testify on behalf of two items in the military construction appropriation bill. They are both in the bill as recommended by the Defense Department and approved by the Budget Bureau. One is the sum of $337,000 for the tying-in of Benecia Arsenal sewer plant with the city of Benecia sewer treatment plant. At present the Benecia Arsenal simply dumps its raw sewage into the Carquinez Straits, and that raw sewage at present just goes right down into San Francisco Bay and constitutes a menace to health, to fish, to swimming and everything else. It has been a very sore subject to all the people of the bay area because the California Water Pollution Control Board has been able to bring into line every city in the bay area under the rules and regulations and laws of the State of California, but the Federal installations are exempt from it. Now, we have the Federal Government in the unenviable position of having the two remaining installations that are dumping sewage into San Francisco Bay, Benecia Arsenal, and Treasure Island, the Navy installation. That leads me to the second item that I would like to testify in favor of, the $700,000 also in the military construction bill submitted by the Defense Department for a similar sewage treatment plant at Treasure Island, the Navy installation. That is the other agency that today is dumping raw sewage into San Francisco Bay.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, when I was growing up as a youngster, my parents and I used to go swimming on what was known as Neptune Beach near Alameda. Today nobody would think of going swimming in San Francisco Bay and although heroic effort is being made by communities around the bay to correct this condition, they are now pointing to the Federal Government and saying, "We are doing our part but the Federal Government still through these two installations is dumping raw sewage into the bay."

All the other installations have corrected their situation. Mare Island Naval Shipyard has put in a proper sewage disposal plant. These are the last two violators.

I think the Defense Department has taken proper action, including these funds in the bill submitted and I urge your committee to act favorably on these two budget items.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your presentation. I assure you the committee will take into consideration the gentleman's presentation. We will have further testimony pertaining to the subject matter. Are there any questions, Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. No questions. You have covered the subject pretty thoroughly, I think, Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you, Mr. Baldwin.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1960.

POLLUTION OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY

WITNESS

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have before us this morning the Honorable John F. Shelley, representing the bay district. I understand, Mr. Shelley, that you have some ideas pertaining to the appropriation requests that are presently pending before the committee and on which you wish to make some presentations?

Mr. SHELLEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Please proceed.

Mr. SHELLEY. First of all, may I say I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, for allowing me the opportunity to appear before you.

You have, as I understand, in this appropriation two items that have been approved by the Budget, $701,000 for the installation of a sewage treatment plant at Treasure Island, the naval base facility in the center of San Francisco Bay, and also $337,000 for similar installation at the Benicia Arsenal.

I sincerely hope that your committee will see fit to allow those items and see that these facilities are installed. The State of California some years ago passed a State law requiring all municipalities to set up sewage treatment plants and to cease and desist from dumping raw sewage into rivers and bays.

The only facilities in the entire bay area that continued to dump into the bay untreated raw human sewage were the Federal military facilities.

I succeeded in having the Navy install at Hunters Point at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard 4 years ago a system which has cut into the city system and has eliminated that source. The following year they did a similar job at the Presidio of San Francisco so that as far as I know, at the present time the only two Federal facilities that are dumping raw sewage into the bay and its tributaries are Treasure Island and Benicia. The communities around the bay area and the State of California certainly feel that they should be eliminated. I sincerely hope that your committee will go along with it.

Mr. Cohelan, who is here, succeeded in getting through the Armed Services Committee an authorization bill which was passed earlier.

His explanation to that committee succeeded in getting their unanimous approval of eliminating the dumpage of raw sewage.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much. By the way, Mr. Shelley, if there is any desire upon your part to review the record that is made here this morning, it will be available in the Capitol in room P–3 from the hours of 2:30 this afternoon to 5 p.m., if you care to check it at all. That will be your privilege. If you wish to extend your remarks, at that time, in the record pertaining to the subject matter you presented it will be your privilege.

Mr. SHELLEY. Thank you. I might also state for your information and the other members of the committee and for the record that I have always had the most courteous cooperation and treatment from the clerk of this committee, whom I consider a very able and loyal assistant to you gentlemen on the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1960.

POLLUTION OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY

WITNESS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are happy to have with us this morning the Honorable Jeffery Cohelan who represents the Seventh District of California.

Mr. COHELAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my purpose in appearing before you today is to urge favorable action on two specific appropriations for sewage disposal facilities at Federal military installations in the San Francisco Bay area of California—one at Treasure Island Naval Station aand another at Benicia Arsenal. Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

It is my understanding that both projects are included in the President's budget requests for 1961, the Treasure Island item in the amount of $701,000 for a sewage treatment plant and the Benicia Arsenal item in the amount of $337,000 for construction of a sewer system to be connected to that of the city of Benicia, Calif. Both have already been authorized, the former in last year's military construction bill and the latter in this year's measure, through amendments which I was able to offer as a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Inasmuch as we know of no opposition to these projects, I will not take the committee's time in prolonged arguments, but only list a few points which will be important in your deliberations:

(1) Treasure Island Naval Station and Benicia Arsenal are primary among the remaining sources of pollution of San Francisco Bay. For a number of years the Regional Water Pollution Control Board has reported time and again that Treasure Island is directly respon-

sible for befouled bay waters and strong, nauseating sewage odors and that Benicia Arsenal is pouring almost half as much raw sewage into Carquinez Straits and thus into San Francisco Bay every 24 hours.

(2) While the communities and industries ringing the bay have spent nearly $150 million for water pollution control facilities in the last 10 years, the Federal Government, at these two military installations, has actually continued to allow contamination in violation of restrictions set by the Regional Water Pollution Control Board as long ago as 1954.

(3) Appropriations for construction to end pollution from Treasure Island are supported by all eight Members of Congress whose districts ring San Francisco Bay and by the two Senators from California as well. Early this year we issued a joint public statement to that effect. While we have not issued another statement with reference to the Benicia project, I am willing to say that I am certain that the same unanimity exists here also, and that those of my colleagues who are able to appear here today will bear out that conclusion.

(4) The California State Legislature, in Assembly Joint Resolution 5 passed earlier this year, has advised the U.S. Congress of its support for appropriation of "the necessary funds to correct the condition of pollution being created by the Benicia Arsenal and the Treasure Island installation." The full text of this resolution is reprinted on page A3557 of the Congressional Record of April 26, 1960.

(5) Evidence of concern over pollution from Treasure Island Naval Station and Benicia Arsenal on the part of all residents of the San Francisco Bay area is the long series of articles and editorials which have appeared in the area's press. As an example, I would cite an editorial from the February 1, 1960, edition of the San Francisco Chronicle which concludes:

> The Federal Government, spending millions to control water pollution wherever it occurs, can hardly refuse this relatively small expenditure to clean up this unsavory mess of its own making.

The full text of this editorial is reprinted on page A1136 of the Congressional Record of February 10, 1960.

Mr. Chairman, may I remind members of the committee that San Francisco Bay is not only a major west coast port, but also a commercial and sport fishery, a recreation center for yachtsmen and others, and the center of one of the Nation's fastest growing urban communities, including the major cities of San Francisco and Oakland and innumerable smaller cities. For these reasons, the problem of bay pollution has been an urgent matter for some time for all of us.

In appropriating funds to halt pollution at Treasure Island Naval Station and at Benicia Arsenal, we will only be seeing to it that the Federal Government does its fair share to end this problem.

Thank you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The chairman wishes to express his appreciation for the gentleman's appearance. You aways represent your district in a very able and competent manner. The Chair might say you represent it aggressively equally as well. I am sure when we come to the marking up of the bill the gentleman's comments will be evaluated

in accordance with those we have to deal with and in accordance with the general conditions with which we are confronted at that time.

Mr. COHELAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is always a pleasure to have you appear before the committee with anything of interest you have within the bill.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1960.

YUMA TEST STATION, YUMA, ARIZ.

WITNESS

HON. D. S. SAUND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have with us the Honorable D. S. Saund, representing his congressional district.

He has some subject matter that he wishes to present to this committee.

Congressman Saund, if you will make your presentation, we will be most pleased to receive it.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Chairman, I have a two-page statement. If you will permit me, I would like to read it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Chairman, I have requested time to appear before your distinguished committee this morning concerning an item which appears in the proposed act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, known as H.R. 10777.

The item consists of $137,000 for the Yuma Test Station of the Department of the Army at Yuma, Ariz.

In particular, I wish to question the propriety of a requested appropriation of $49,000 for a quartermaster test building.

Information has been furnished to me, supported by investigations of the Military Operations Subcommitee of the House Government Operations Committee, that the expenditure would serve to continue and expand a certain duplication of existing work and facilities at the El Centro Naval Landing Field, El Centro, Calif.

The Department of Defense in 1951 established a joint project for testing of parachutes and methods of delivery from the air at the El Centro Base. The project was to be used by all three of the armed services. While the Air Force and Navy are making excellent use of the facilities, the Army has made little or no use of them.

The project is under the management of the Department of the Navy. Recently, Adm. Paul D. Stroop, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons, advised that vacant facilities for this purpose are available to the Army. I ask unanimous consent that my statement and a copy of the letter from Admiral Stroop be included as part of the record.

(The letter follows:)

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Military Operations Subcommittee,
Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to an oral request from Mr. Earl Morgan of your staff, I am pleased to furnish the following information on the naval parachute facility, El Centro, Calif.

In 1958 Army representatives informally explored with naval and Air Force representatives the possibility of moving Army parachute research and development activity to El Centro.

At that time, the El Centro station was being used nearly to capacity by fleet air units. Both airspace and operational facilities were taxed. Neither housing nor hangar space was available for Army use.

Since that time, however, the station has been reduced to an auxiliary landing field, and the great majority of fleet training has been moved to other locations, leaving vacant facilities which could now be made available for Army use.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. STROOP,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons.

In the interest of economy, the Army should make full use of the joint facilities which are available for this purpose at El Centro.

On January 21, 1958, the Army indicated it would relocate research and engineering aerial delivery test activities from For Lee, Va., to Yuma, and the program subsequently has been initiated, according to information which has been furnished me. Recommended expansion of facilities at Yuma includes millions of dollars' worth of facilities identical to those available for use by the Army under exact weather conditions only 60 airmiles distant at the El Centro base.

On February 18, 1960, I appeared beofre the House Armed Services Committee to protest the authorization of duplicate facilities at Yuma. Through misunderstanding, my remarks were interpreted to mean that I wish the transfer of all activities at the Yuma Test Station to El Centro. This is not the case. My desire is that the Army carry out the directive of the Department of Defense in 1951 that the El Centro facilities be used by all branches of the services for the testing of parachutes and methods of delivery from the air.

This would mean a halt of any unnecessary buildup at Yuma of facilities which are currently in existence a short distance away and available for use by the Army.

This intention is evident in the testimony of Maj. Gen. Lyle E. Seeman, Director of Installations of the Department of the Army, before the House Committee on Armed Services during recent hearings on H.R. 10220 and H.R. 10777. In referring to the request for construction of a fire and crash station at the Laguna Airfield, Yuma Test Station, at a costof $88,000, General Seeman said, in part: "In view of recent rapid expansion and anticipated developments, operations as are now conducted are inadequate."

I am not objecting to the construction of the fire and crash station because it is apparently needed for the protection of life and property at the base.

My objection is solely to the expenditure for additional facilities at Yuma Test Station which would duplicate excellent existing facilities at El Centro.

If the Army's request for expansion at Yuma is allowed, additional expenditures of millions of dollars may be required to construct supplemental facilities such as a whirl tower, a drop tower, a wind tunnel, textile laboratory, additional photo laboratory facilities, expanded theodolite tracking system, and aircraft maintenance facilities. Such facilities are now in existence and available for use at El Centro.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the existing permanent facilities at El Centro be utilized by the Army before funds are approved to construct duplicate installations at Yuma.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much for your presentation. I assure you that at the time we mark up the bill your comments will be taken into consideration in conjunction, of course, with the testimony that we have covering the subject matter as a whole.

Thank you very much for your appearance.

Are there any questions?

Mr. JONAS. No questions.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1960.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., AREA

WITNESSES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HON. CLYDE DOYLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HON. RAYMOND C. KEALER, MAYOR, LONG BEACH, CALIF.
H. E. RIDINGS, CHAIRMAN, HARBER COMMISSION, CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.
SAM M. ROBERTS, SUBSIDENCE CONTROL ADMINISTRATOR, CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.
W. C. WADE, LEGISLATIVE ADVISER, CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIF.
HARRY FULTON, SUBSIDENCE EDITOR, LONG BEACH INDEPENDENT PRESS TELEGRAM
DONALD G. SUTHERLAND, PRESIDENT, LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have with us this morning the Honorable Craig Hosmer, Representative from California. He has with him a witness. He wishes to cover a matter of local interest in the Long Beach area.

If you wish to make a presentation at this time, we would be glad to hear you.

Mr. HOSMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, we appreciate your courtesy in letting us fill in, in the record, again on this problem. The mayor of the city of Long Beach is here, as he has been in years past and with him are the principal persons who have taken leadership in this.

For the purpose of the record, I would like to introduce Mr. H. E. "Bud" Ridings, chairman of the Long Beach Harbor Commission, Mr. Samuel Roberts, coordinator of the subsidence control program of the city of Long Beach, Mr. W. C. Wade, legislative adviser of the city, Donald G. Sutherland, president of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard Employees Association, and Mr. Harry Fulton, who has done the public relations work on the project.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is a pleasure to have all of you gentlemen with us.

Is it my understanding, Congressman, that Mayor Kealer will make the presentation?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes, sir. If there are any details that need to be filled in by the experts they will supply them. I would like to say

Mr. Doyle will be here shortly to speak on this matter. I would like to say a few short words, if I may.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is your privilege.

Mr. HOSMER. There have been a number of groups who worked together to take this rather unique problem and engineering mystery and work it out so that there has been a subsidence stoppage at this shipyard. The whole harbor area consisting of about 22 square miles is affected. This work was not done by any one group necessarily. It had to be a cooperative effort, including the city of Long Beach, the State of California, the Navy itself, the Justice Department.

The committee itself has been one of the leading movers in this field. Progress was sufficient so that the provision of the 1959 authorization was to the effect that the Secretary of the Navy should find that subsidence should be arrested before the $5 million of that authorization was subject to appropriation. That was met a few weeks ago and I have received from the Navy an indication of what their first new increment would be in light of this subsidence stoppage and what would be necessary to begin the remedial work.

It amounts to $3,915,000, broken into three different projects. I would like to submit this letter from the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Navy, dated May 3, 1960, as part of my testimony, Mr. Chairman, so that it will be a matter of record and so that the committee will know what firm plans have been made.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Without objection, the letter will be made a part of the record.

(The letter follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1960.

MY DEAR MR. HOSMER: This is in reply to your letter of April 28, 1960, requesting that you be advised of the nature and amount of subsidence remedial work at the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. You indicated that this information might be used when you testify before the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

As indicated in your letter, the budget submission for fiscal 1961 did not request funds for subsidence remedial work at Long Beach, because it had not yet been determined that subsidence in the area was satisfactorily arrested. The remedial measures yet to be effected at the shipyard have been divided into four increments which will provide for the orderly accomplishment of the work. The next increment which we plan to request funds for will include the following work which was authorized in fiscal year 1959:

Pier No. 5, raise deck, utilities, etc	$2,215,000
Drydock No. 2, raise sides, utilities	420,000
Land area behind seawall, pier No. 1 to drydock No. 2, raise tracks and utilities, retaining walls, and fill area	1,280,000
Total	3,915,000

I trust the information set forth above will be of assistance to you. With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

F. A. BANTZ,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. HOSMER. As you know, the finding by the Secretary was made after the budget was submitted and as a consequence there is no request from the Navy Department officially pending before the subcommittee. I would like to make my testimony this morning in the nature of a request, based on the figures that have been submitted by

the Under Secretary and in making the request I wish to say that the private oil operators and the city and all the groups involved out there in this effort have shown the most extreme good faith. Some 6,500 shipyard employees, through their associations and individually, have done a tremendous job to forward this. This is a matter of morale in the whole effort that would be preserved by a recognition that the work that this committee has demanded has been done and I think the preservation of the accelerated pace of the program would certainly be insured if the committee can find either the amount that should be spent on this first increment or part of it.

There are three parts, each of which is independent of the other, which could be subject to funding.

I will turn it over to Mayor Kealer for a progress report, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. SHEPPARD. All right. We will hear his honor, the mayor.

STATEMENT OF MAYOR RAYMOND C. KEALER

Mayor KEALER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. Let me say the prepared statement I have will take only about 4 minutes to read. In the course of it, there is a little map at the end of it I would like to refer to when I come to it so you will be a little more clear as to what we are saying.

My name is Raymond C. Kealer. I am mayor of the city of Long Beach, Calif. I have been a member of the City Council of Long Beach for 13 years and for 7 years I was chairman of the council's committee on harbor, industries, and oil. I am a registered petroleum engineer.

I appeared before your honorable committee on June 25, 1958, on the matter of subsidence remedial construction appropriations for 1958–59 for the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach. I am very proud to report on this occasion, approximately 2 years thereafter, that we have now successfully controlled subsidence in the Long Beach Naval Shipyard area. Bench mark measurements by Long Beach Harbor Department engineers, by Navy personnel, and by civilian personnel of the Defense Department all confirm subsidence has been stopped in the shipyard.

If you will refer to the map on page 3, I would like to point out the items I referred to awhile ago.

You will notice that you have a blue area and then some lines in orange, but within the blue area, if you will note, there are three curved lines within it. The first curved line shows the smallest area, taking the outer mold of the shipyard, and in 1958 that was the extent to which subsidence had stopped.

The next one, of May 1959, shows the lines moving landward from the original. Then in October 1959, still farther, and the last one, which I believe is in March of this year, is the one incorporated within the blue area. That is where subsidence has stopped, which you will note takes in all of the Navy shipyard except the little tiny portion in the northeast corner. All of the area enclosed by the orange line is where subsidence has been substantially reduced.

Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke on March 10 announced his finding to this effect, stating that "sufficient action has been taken

and arrangements made to arrest the further subsidence of this shipyard."

We now have in full operation all the planned injection wells for the shipyard area. In an area defined by Navy consultants as the "shipyard area flood," we are injecting slightly in excess of the 153,000 barrels per day originally programed and scheduled for the area. In the total Wilmington field there are 128 injection wells now in operation and we are injecting 355,000 barrels of water per day. At the injection peak in December 1959, we reached 425,000 barrels per day. However, fill-up occurring in some sands, and other engineering reasons made necessary a slight cut in injection rate from this amount. All necessary water source wells, high pressure pumping plants, and distribution lines have been installed and are in operation for the shipyard area and surrounding areas. Eighty-five percent of pump plant requirements of the entire field have been constructed. Only two small installations remain for the fieldwide program. The city and cooperating oil operators have expended in excess of $18 million for water injection facilities—$15 million by the city and $3 million by private oil operators.

Unitization has been completed for all private properties north of Seaside Boulevard in the shipyard area. Operations on tidelands properties are being conducted under cooperative agreements with the units pending completion of certain test litigation to permit actual joining of tidelands properties with the units. Regardless of the results of the letigation, representing operations in the tidelands will be continued under presently executed contracts with members of the units referred to. Unitization agreements for the adjoining fault blocks IV and V are in the negotiation stage. All the major interests have entered into written memorandums of intent to complete the units, and we are certain these commitments will be kept. The adjacent southerly area of fault block I immediately west of the shipyard is under full pressure maintenance. Cooperative agreements have been executed by all necessary parties in the latter area and are now in force on a permanent basis.

In previous testimony before your honorable committee I mentioned the large scale "crash" engineering program that was underway. This program has now been completed and engineering plans for all the necessary subsidence control areas have been submitted to the State supervisor of oil and gas, and have met with his approval. Over $1,500,000 has been expended in the engineering program by the city and cooperating private interests.

So that there will be no concern as to future conduct of repressuring operations, both the Long Beach City Council and the board of harbor commissioners passed formal policy resolutions as to continuance of future operations and their necessary expansion. Also, at the request of the General Counsel for the Navy, and the Defense Department, we have even entered into a formal, legally enforcible, unilateral contract with the Defense Department concerning this matter. In order to insure the city's ability to comply with the contractual obligation, provision has been made in the unit agreements and other contracts whereby the city is given the right to take over and use any injection wells of private producers it deems necessary, after commercial oil production has ceased.

We have made certain commitments in the past. We have met those commitments. The enginering program is completed, and plans have been approved by the State supervisor. All required water injection wells are in operation in the shipyard area. Unitization is in effect. Most important, we have succeeded in stopping subsidence in the critical shipyard area. On the basis of all expert opinion on this problem, I sincerely believe the Long Beach Naval Shipyard is fully protected from the danger of further damage from subsidence.

It gives me great pleasure to appear before your committee and to be able to report upon a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that we have a number of supporting data and technical matters which will be submitted to you for the record, to be taken and used at your discretion.

Mr. HOSMER. I think Mayor Kealer would like exhibit C, the supporting data for his testimony, to be a matter of record and other materials we will file unless you want them in the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On the subject matter that is capable of being reproduced, we will be pleased to see that it becomes a component part of the record. There are certain graph aspects we cannot handle in the record.

I do want to thank you gentlemen for your cooperation with this committee and your Congressman for his cooperation. We were confronted, as you well know, with a very difficult situation. It made it very embarrassing to all of us to be confronted with a problem of that character. However, you appeared before the committee originally and stated your position very clearly and you have not only functioned to the degree that I think was scientifically possible to achieve, but aside from that, you have been gracious enough to keep this Chair and the committee posted on what I call your progress conditions from time to time.

They have been very, very helpful in reviewing this situation.

It is cooperation of this character, gentlemen, that always leaves a little bit more favorable impression, I think you are aware of that as well as I.

Insofar as the balance of the program is concerned, your statement is very clear to the effect that you contemplate no difficulties and that your contractural procedures have clearly eliminated any potentialities of the difference of attainments you have to acquire between now and the termini of the situation because of the contractual nature of them; is that correct?

Mayor KEALER. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not think I have any further questions on the subject.

Mr. Jonas?

Mr. JONAS. I have no questions. It is a very clear statement.

Mayor KEALER. Thank you. I may add this, that while $18 million have been expended, plus an additional $2 million for engineering costs, but the entire operating costs over the whole full length period to its termination will be probably in the nature of $120 million, which, of course, will be paid for out of income from oil operations in the field. The city, as you know, has financed most of this program and then will get its money back based on additional production, if any, with proper provisions made for amortization, et cetera.

This $120 million is well known to all of the industry. They have all cooperated. They understand that clearly. We anticipate no difficulties whatever, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to compliment you and your Congressman for the cooperation you have extended the committee on a very difficult problem. With that cooperation our work has been made much easier than it was.

Thank you very much for your presentation.

Please meet that deadline so we can get this record printed as soon as possible.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOYLE. I apologize for being a few minutes late. I was necessarily in the Armed Services Committee.

I want to supplement, if I may, very briefly the testimony of these gentlemen from Long Beach on this issue.

Long Beach, as the chairman knows, no longer is in my congressional district, but it was for several years.

I think the record will show that perhaps I was in very close touch with the origination of this subsidence problem way back in 1945 and 1946 when I flew from Washington, D.C., to my home on four occasions at my own expense and appeared before the Harbor Board of Long Beach urging them at that time to begin to do something tangible within the law to whip the problem of subsidence.

At that time the Navy indicated to me that they would appreciate, and they would expect the powers to be, their trying to have the interested parties who were producing oil reduce their production by about 25 percent to see what, if any, effect that had on this sinking.

Growing out of the status of the problem at that time, the city did that for a time—I am sure in good faith—as far as they could. At that time they were unable to obtain the cooperation of the other major producers in the area. At that time they would not cooperate with the city extensively enough to have the city in a legal position at that time to proceed.

The record of that time will show that at the suggestion of the harbor board, I myself—and I mention this only because I think the record ought to show that the city and the producers have made very, very commendable progress—at that time I, myself, as Representative in Congress from that area then sent a registered communication to all the major producers asking them to cooperate with the city in making this test which the Navy then suggested.

To be very brief, then, I think I would like to refer to a record rather than reading a record in the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 85th Congress, May 14 to 28 and June 4 through 19, 1957.

Beginning at page 2280 of this record, and continuing to and including a portion of page 2286, there appears the discussion in the House Armed Services Committee on this problem. Some of the facts therein related are pertinent to this occasion.

I am sure the chairman of this subcommittee will recall that Chairman Vinson sent a subcommittee to the site of the subsidence, consisting of Mr. Norblad, of Oregon; Mr. Wilson, of California; and

also Mr. Craig Hosmer, in whose district the yard has been for several years; in company with us.

We made a report to the House Armed Services Committee which was approved.

There are three short paragraphs in the recommendation.

On page 2285 it states:

> Based on the foregoing it is the recommendation of the subcommittee that until there is full evidence that every possible action is being taken to prevent subsidence in the area of the naval shipyard, the Federal Government should make no further expenditures for remedial work other than that necessary to provide minimum protection to the Government property involved.
>
> Specifically, the subcommittee recommends that the work contemplated for the second increment, originally estimated to cost $4,660,000 but now estimated to cost $5,825,000, be implemented only to the extent of $1,500,000 which, the Navy states, is sufficient to provide immediately necessary remedial protective works. This sum will provide for additional protective works required for the coming year.
>
> The subcommittee wishes to make one further recommendation and that is that the subcommittee be continued in existence.

We were then dismissed.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that while this important area is not in my congressional district, I have endeavored to keep in touch with it. I have visited this area on several occasions in the last 6 years. I have been personally escorted about the area by the city officials, representatives, engineers, work being done in the interest of subsidence has been called to my attention, and I believe that the statement by the Honorable Secretary of the Navy, William Franke, on March 10 that sufficient action has been taken and arrangements made to arrest the further subsidence at the shipyard, meets for the present, at least, the situation.

I understand he has had expert engineering and geological advice, and I think that that statement by him carries out the original recommendation of this subcommittee of which I had the responsibility of being chairman back in 1957.

I wish to support the position of the city of Long Beach in this report made today by the honorable mayor and his associates.

As chairman of this committee, Mr. Sheppard, you know Long Beach as well as any of us. You know the strategic importance of that facility in the interest of national defense. You know the great value of it because of its location. You know of its great efficiency.

I wish to thank the chairman for granting me these few moments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Your comments at the moment are not only acceptable but you have manifested your interest over a long period of time in this project, of course, with regard to this project, both good, bad, and indifferent.

We on this committee feel grateful to you gentlemen who have cooperated in getting this problem resolved.

It is not alone the accomplishment which has come about in the Long Beach area as such. While within itself it is a contribution to the military stature of the area, nevertheless, if my information is correct, this is quite a contribution to anything of like character that might come along elsewhere later on. There is clear evidence now there is way of controlling subsidence in circumstances which created the condition at Long Beach.

There may be some difference of opinion about the origin and just what did occur there. I don't know whether the scientists resolved that or not, but I have been interested in your thinking on that.

Have you any comment to make on the original cause of this?

Mayor KEELER. I believe this, without stating what other people's opinions might be as to the reasons for it: We know that all people in the area, operators and so forth, are thoroughly familiar with and are committed to going through with the solution of this problem, as I outlined to you earlier, and they understand very well what is the cause and effect. That may be debatable, but they are willing and have agreed in writing to go ahead with this.

I will also say this: It is my firm conviction that this program will be carried through to a successful completion and conclusion by all parties and interests. It behooves us all, not only the shipyard but the harbor and the city itself, if there were a failure in the shipyard area it would be a failure throughout the entire harbor, so we must do all we can to keep this.

I would like to say this to you in closing: We in Long Beach sincerely appreciate your open and frank acceptance of everything we have had to say. While sometimes we have not been happy with what you have told us you have at least been willing to listen to us and come back and see if there is anything more we have to say. We appreciate that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know you realize there is a time when we have to make up our minds as to what should be done. I will admit perhaps my approach was somewhat aggressive in the past.

It frankly occurred to me this was very essential. I have discussed this subject with both Mr. Hosmer and Mr. Doyle in the past. I do not think there was much difference of opinion in the fact that something should be done. We have an obligation here to see that the taxpayers' money is expended in the best way possible.

This has now come to a reasonable conclusion, and I repeat that it has been only through the complete cooperation of all of us concerned that we have achieved the end results which have come about. As far as I am personally concerned, and I think I can speak for my colleagues, we appreciate the help of all of you.

Mr. HOSMER. If I may make the record clear on this, although all these achievements have been accomplished, I feel, and the mayor feels, and I know everybody concerned with this feels, that if it had not been for the assistance and thereby the inspiration of the chairman and of this committee the action would not have been taken.

We are all grateful to you for it because it means not only so much to this parrticular installation but to the entire area.

We owe you a deep debt of gratitude, sir.

Mayor KEELER. Your city council and your harbor commission both have a dedicated policy that subsidence has No. 1 priority and it takes precedence over anything else.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well, gentlemen.

Thank you for your appearance.

U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, N.J.

WITNESSES

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY
MAJ. GEN. S. D. AKIN (RETIRED), FORMER CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER
BRIG. GEN. JOHN C. MONAHAN, CHIEF, R. AND D. DIVISION, OFFICE OF CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER
DR. CRAIG M. CRENSHAW, CHIEF SCIENTIST FOR THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER

Mr. Sheppard. We have the Honorable James C. Auchincloss and his associates.

We welcome you and ask you to present your group for the record and present the subject matter in which you are interested.

Mr. Auchincloss. I have a brief statement, Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed.

Mr. Sheppard. Yes, indeed.

Mr. Auchincloss. I am interested in this project at Fort Monmouth. It is right in the middle of my district and it is a matter which has been close to my heart in the development of the Signal Corps activities.

This project was called to my attention by General Akin, who was the Chief Signal Officer when the Hexagon was started. He feels there is every reason to have this job completed.

He has brought with him General Monahan and Dr. Crenshaw, who are here to answer technicalities.

I would appreciate it if you would let General Akin present his statement and then reply to any questions you might have.

You may recall that I sent you a copy of a letter that I received from General Akin with several enclosures.

If it is in order, I would like to ask that it be placed in the record.

Mr. Sheppard. It may be inserted in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

Purcellville, Va., *April 1, 1960.*

Hon. James C. Auchincloss,
House of Representatives.

Dear Jim: I have been informed that some difficulty may be experienced by the Chief Signal Officer in obtaining the appropriation in the House during this session of Congress for the completion of the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory building at Fort Monmouth, N.J. You may recall that this new laboratory building was initiated during my tour of duty as Chief Signal Officer. It was then and is today a subject of great personal interest to me because of the tremendous contribution the completed building offers to Army's research and development effort.

The request for the final increment of this building is now being defended before the Congress. The House has authorized this construction, and hearings are being held by the DOD Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

This committee had a group of investigators visit General Cook, the Deputy Chief Signal Officer at Fort Monmouth, to evaluate this request. Judging from the questions asked during the subcommittee hearing (before Mr. Sheppard) there appear to be some misconceptions arising from the report submitted by these investigators. I am unable to secure a copy of this report.

In order to acquaint you with the essential facts of this case, I am taking the liberty of inclosing with this letter a brief résumé of the history of and justification for the laboratory building, a summarization of the type of questions asked by the subcommittee, and a brief of a study made by General O'Connell indicating substantial potential reduction in leadtime in the Signal R. & D. program.

I am presenting these facts to you in order to solicit your assistance in securing the completion of this building, which may well be in jeopardy.

I hope you do not mind hearing from an old and retired soldier on this matter. As a former Chief Signal Officer, I have been most appreciative of your untiring support of the Army and the Signal Corps and particularly of the construction of the new signal laboratory. I know that you will afford this matter your personal attention.

Sincerely yours,

S. B. AKIN,
Major General, U.S. Army, Retired.

HISTORY AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THE U.S. ARMY SIGNAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY BUILDING

1. The U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory (USASRDL) was founded in 1918 at Camp Alfred Vail (now Fort Monmouth), N.J. Its strength at that time was approximately 114 and its mission was to conduct radio experimentation in tanks and aerial warfare. After USASRDL was established, its mission, strength, and facilities requirements expanded extensively and, to obtain needed space, it was dispersed among several locations in New Jersey. By the end of World War II, it occupied many scattered buildings, mostly temporary, at and in the vicinity of Fort Monmouth.

2. To eliminate the evident disadvantages of a widely dispersed research and development operation, a completely integrated laboratory building was designed and programed at an estimated cost of $22,050,000 in fiscal year 1948. Authorization for its construction was requested, but disapproved, each year from fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1951. In 1952 the new laboratory building was finally approved for construction, but in three increments. The first increment was funded by Congress for $6,250,000 in fiscal year 1952, with construction begun in October 1952 and completed in September 1954. The second increment was funded for $7,500,000 in fiscal year 1953. Construction of the second increment was started in August 1953 and was completed March 1955. This partial facility, located adjacent to the Garden State Parkway in the Camp Wood area of Fort Monmouth, is about two-thirds of the original designed structure and is presently utilized to its maximum capacity. Inclosure 2 shows it as it appears today.

3. So vital to the accomplishments of the Army R. & D. mission is the completion of this laboratory building that the Chief Signal Officer has continued to press for authority to complete the structure for the past 6 years. In the fiscal year 1961 Signal MCA priority listing, the completion of this building is again assigned a high priority. This is because the incomplete structure is inadequate to provide the minimum laboratory space to meet the present requirements and, even less so, the anticipated future requirements in the vital field of electronics in support of the missile and space programs. The third increment is now before Congress for authorization and appropriation ($7,871,000) in the MCA program for fiscal year 1961. Inclosure 3 shows how the completed building will appear.

4. The building is of steel and concrete construction with a Robertson Q floor of steel, and double concrete walls. It is ventilated with filtered air; there is no comfort air conditioning. Heating is by high-pressure steam. When completed, the structure will be an efficient four-story, six-sided building where any 2-foot square, without any structural changes, can be supplied with 60 or 400 cycle power, hot and cold water, compressed air, natural gas, telephone outlets, and a drain for any type of sink. The hexagonal form was chosen because it gives the lowest construction cost per square foot.

5. At the present time, the Signal research and development operations are split between the incomplete Laboratory building and mostly temporary buildings, not suitable for R. & D. activities, which are located about 12 miles distant in the Evans area. The disadvantages of attempting to conduct related R. & D. activities at locations separated by several miles, the difficulty of obtaining the required close technical coordination between researcher and developer split

between the two locations, and the great amount of time lost in travel to obtain this coordination all have a very detrimental effect on the R. & D. cycle. In fact, the time lost because of the strictures on the free exchange of unclassified and particularly classified information and materiel imposed by the present scattered physical facilities is intolerable in this age of explosively rapid developments in the electronics field. The completion of the Laboratory building will result in the reduction of the present 9- to 12-year Signal research and development cycle to a significant degree, and the elimination of unacceptable delays in the national R. & D. effort in the satellite, missile, nucleonics, and other communication-electronics fields.

6. The scope of the R. & D. mission at USASRDL has increased 340 percent during the period from fiscal year 1951 through fiscal year 1959. The following figures reflect magnitude of this program during this period:

Fiscal year:	*Millions*	Fiscal year—Continued	*Millions*
1951	$62.0	1956	$103.7
1952	64.1	1957	149.1
1953	66.1	1958	191.7
1954	77.5	1959	210.0
1955	99.7		

7. The existing space age projects for NASA and ARPA at USASRDL provide for current funding of about $15,500,000 with an estimated future expenditure of $30 million more. An additional space project under active consideration will involve a funded effort of at least $40 million. At such time as transfer of certain space communications projects to the U.S. Army Signal Corps in accordance with DOD directive takes place, it is estimated that space projects involving funding aggregating $250 million over the next 5 years will become the responsibility of USASRDL.

8. Full use is presently being made by the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory of available academic, commercial, and Government laboratories through the placement of R. & D. contracts. The instruction, supervision, and control of R. & D. contracts placed with the universities, with industry, and with other Government laboratories is exercised by the personnel and in-house research and development work of the laboratories. Private enterprise is being utilized to the maximum extent practicable consistent with national security. Of the total funds allocated to USASRDL during fiscal year 1960 and fiscal year 1961, approximately 65 percent will be expended for R. & D. efforts by industrial laboratories and the research of universities and colleges. The other 35 percent is used for internal research and to provide the effort required to properly guide industrial and university laboratories in the R. & D. program. At this time, USASRDL has 1,200 research and development projects, tasks, and subtasks in progress. In fiscal year 1960, thus far, 127 projects and tasks have been completed. The Laboratory has 774 active research and development contracts which have a total dollar value of $406 million.

9. The number of personnel currently employed in the Hexagon Building is about 2,100 while about 1,000 are engaged in the Evans area. With the completion of the entire Laboratory structure, the total personnel occupying the building will be approximately 3,100. A small residue to be left in the Evans area will be mainly employed in manning the far end of test communication facilities for signals originated at the Laboratory proper, as well as other fixed facilities that will not be moved.

10. The gross floor space available in the present incomplete building is 665,000 square feet and an additional 290,864 square feet will be provided by completion. This action will release 234,000 square feet in the Evans area. It is important to note that included in these values are space requirements for bulky test equipment needing, in many cases, special environmental conditions. Examples are an anechaic chamber which provides a noise-free environment for radio test; large sound- and dust-proof, temperature and humidity controlled areas for frequency control, thin film, and solid state physics work; and facilities for simulating noise in outer space.

11. As soon as Laboratory activities are consolidated from the Evans area into the completed building at Fort Monmouth, the Evans area will be utilized to house the U.S. Army Signal Equipment Support agency which is presently located in the temporary structures of the Coles area near Red Bank, N.J. It is anticipated that there will then be no requirement for the Coles area, which consists of 46 acres and over 100,000 square feet of buildings, and that it will be declared excess to the needs of the Signal Corps.

12. Failure to complete the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory Building as originally designed will further preclude the Chief Signal Officer from accomplishing his dynamic mission in the electronics field, will prevent the urgently required reduction in the present 9- to 12-year development cycle to an acceptable level, and will require that the present inefficient time-consuming operations be continued.

RÉSUMÉ OF TYPE QUESTIONS ASKED BY MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

1. Mr. Sheppard:

(*a*) Questions the Chief Signal Officer's estimate of the magnitude of R. & D. leadtime reduction.

(See inclosure No. 3 for justification.)

(*b*) Questions the accomplishment of Signal R. & D. effort in Army-owned facilities in lieu of accomplishing this work by contract.

(Maximum amount of Signal R. & D. consistent with security and sound business practice is now being accomplished by contract with private industry and it is planned to continue this practice.)

2. Mr. Whitten:

(*a*) States that the investigative staff has indicated that the present buildings are fully meeting the requirement and that perhaps the construction of this building should be postponed.

(See inclosure No. 1 for justification.)

(*b*) States that the military is spending too much of the national income and that he is concerned about the present financial plight of the Government.

(*c*) Questions whether it was faulty planning that resulted in a parking lot being so located that a portion of it would be lost when the third increment is constructed.

(Low-type bituminous surface parking lots were so located in 1956 to serve the existing incomplete Laboratory building. The area improved was the area which had formerly been utilized in an unimproved condition. A comparatively minor part of the investment in one of these lots will be lost when the third increment is completed.)

3. Mr. Jonas:

(*a*) States that the investigation report indicates that more personnel could be accommodated in the existing permanent Laboratory facility.

(Studies made by the Chief Signal Officer indicate that all existing space is fully utilized.)

(*b*) States that the Chief Signal Officer is inconsistent when he proposes to move the Signal Engineering Equipment Support Agency from the Coles to the Evans area when he is trying to consolidate his R. & D. effort into one general area.

(The activities which would be consolidated by moving the R. & D. functions from the Evans area to the new Laboratory building are strictly R. & D. activities. The move of the Engineering Equipment Support Agency from the Coles to the Evans area would certainly place them 8 miles further away from the Laboratory building; however, this would not be a disadvantage since there is no pressing necessity for these two activities being in contiguous locations.)

BRIEF OF STUDY MADE BY GENERAL O'CONNELL INDICATING SUBSTANTIAL POTENTIAL REDUCTION IN LEADTIME IN THE SIGNAL R. & D. PROGRAM

Failure to provide adequate R. & D. contiguous space at Fort Monmouth has retarded the R. & D. effort in the satellite, missile, and other space projects. The present 9–12 years development cycle will be drastically reduced if this building is completed. The magnitude of the reduction supported by a 1958 Signal Corps study would be in the order of 3 years.

The study estimates potential savings in the following listed areas:

(*a*) Research, 4 months.
(*b*) Contract administration, 3 months.
(*c*) Feasibility study, 3.5 months.
(*d*) Engineering design (ED), 11 months.
(*e*) Component design (conducted during ED–ET time frame).

(*f*) Engineering test (ET), 4 months.
(*g*) Systems demonstration, 2 months.
(*h*) User test, 3 months.
(*i*) Type classification, 1 month.
(*j*) Equipment production, 6 months.
Total, 3 years plus.

These savings would result from improved management communications and administration which may be expected when widely separated activities such as the Evans and R. & D. facilities at Fort Monmouth, which are operationally, administratively, and managerially dependent on each other are consolidated in one location with their laboratory facilities. The addition of the third increment would permit scientific and engineer personnel of both the Evans and Hexagon staff to avail themselves of modern laboratory facilities which are essential for the precision conditions required to cope with the increases in the art of space technology. These modern facilities are necessary to conduct in-house testing and evaluation of equipment submitted by contractors for acceptance, and to conduct minimum essential in-house basic and applied research. Also the Evans staff would have immediate access to the USARDL computer facilities in the Hexagon.

No direct comparison may be made between satellite programs prior to and after completion of the Hexagon but the estimate of savings on a 9-year basis given above is believed a valid comparison for the comment on retardation of the satellite program.

General AKIN. Mr. Sheppard and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to thank you for affording me the opportunity to appear before you in support of the appropriation to complete the constructin of the Army Signal Corps research and development laboratory at Fort Monmouth, N.J.

With your permission I would like to read a statement that I have prepared and then present to you the contents of a brochure in support of the statements.

The Signal Laboratory construction project was initiated by me when I was Chief Signal Officer in the Army some years ago. You will no doubt recall that it was to be constructed in three increments. The first two of these increments have been completed. What is now needed is an appropriation of $7,871,000 to complete the third increment and thereby accomplish the purposes for which the project was initiated.

The purposes of the project were and are to bring about a more efficient and economical operation of the research and development processes thereby reducing the leadtime, that is, the time from the inception of an item until the completion of its research and development, and effecting the maximum financial saving to the Government.

The completion of the third increment of the Laboratory will bring this about by the following means:

First, by providing modern, adequate, and appropriate facilities of the proper type properly housed with the necessary space for the operation.

Second, by permitting the concentration of the Laboratory scientists, engineers, technicians, and other essential personnel now scattered over a wide area, some 11 miles in the case of one group, in one building thereby permitting the ready and prompt access to modern equipment of the appropriate type; the prompt and close association and liaison necessitated by the frequent consultations and conferences incident to the research and development processes; by bringing about necessary and desirable economies in the cost of operations; by the

saving of the time of the highly paid scientific personnel through eliminating the need for travel between widely separated areas; and through eliminating the need for operating an expensive motor pool.

To summarize, the completion of the third increment of the Laboratory, will, through the measures I have just mentioned, bring about an overall reduction in leadtime of about 3 years and effect an overall saving of approximately an estimated $2.7 million a year.

With your permission I would like to now turn to a brochure that I have had prepared to present to you which contains the necessary supporting data of the statement I have made and answer certain questions that previously have arisen in the committee hearings.

If that is agreeable to you we will hand you these brochures. I would like to have them as part of the record and I would also like to run through this very hurriedly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have had a submission of at least a counterpart of this brochure. Of course there is subject matter included here which is not admissible for the record because of printing complications which would be involved.

If you wish to pick highlights from this brochure to substantiate what you have stated it will be your privilege to do that.

In the absence of doing that you may file the brochure for the committee's use.

General AKIN. I would like to point out certain phases of the brochure.

The first item is why does the Signal Corps need an inhouse research and development capability. I have the material here in justification of that.

Unless you desire I will not go into great detail unless you would like to have me discuss that with you.

One of the prime considerations is the matter of having in the Armed Forces the necessary qualified personnel to initiate the projects incidental to the requirements of the Armed Forces and put them in a usable form for industry to produce.

In passing I had experience during the recent war of finding in the Western Pacific that our Allies had no such agency, and they were greatly handicapped, and felt extremely injured by the fact they did not have it.

I established that type of facility in the Western Pacific so we could initiate crash programs to help us in combat with the Japanese enemy.

The next item has to do with the inhouse and external proportion of the money we have for research and development.

Over the past 10 years the Signal Laboratory budget has increased from less than $70 million in 1951 to $210 million in fiscal year 1961. Of the $210 million, $186 million will be contracted to industry and universities. Of the remaining $24 million to be spent at the Laboratory, only $8 million is direct inhouse research and development. The remaining $16 million will be used to plan and direct the contract effort, and test and evaluate the contractual product. It is anticipated that the level of inhouse effort at the Signal Laboraory will remain relatively constant.

Over a period of years that is so, referring to the percentage basis.

The next item is why are existing research and development facilities inadequate to meet present day requirements.

The essential consideration is the space requirements, atomic warfare, and requirements of our satellites in space, and space warfare considerations in which the Signal Corps is involved and in order to provide communication from these various elements.

The most recent project is the TIROS. Prior to that was Courier the satellite which transmitted the voice of the President from outer space. Those are considerations which are now coming into the Laboratory, plus meeting the requirements of atomic warfare. That is the reason we want this increment completed, so we can meet the requirements of modern warfare.

Incident to that is the inefficiency due to dispersion of the personnel, which I have already mentioned in a general way, sir.

Then we have new missions which I just discussed in detail, new missions, communications from aircraft. From an electronic point of view communication from high altitudes is quite a different thing, and it is primarily an Air Force project.

Our problem is to meet the requirements of getting communications over existing obstacles for the ground forces. That is one phase of the avionics question peculiar to the Army and which necessitates development in that field.

Next is combat surveillance and target acquisition. The most recent example was the high resolution radar. Such a radar picture of the Washington area was recently printed in the papers.

Next is automatic data processing. That has to do with machines of the Univac type so we can process the data in the laboratories much more promptly and effectively.

Finally we have astroelectronics, and global strategic communications, in which we have a responsibility.

The next item is what present facilities are being used by the Laboratory. I believe that is an answer to a question which came up before the committee previously. Here is a detailed statement.

The major facilities being used at present are: Present incomplete Hexagon structure of 665,000 square feet; permanent-type structure in Evans area, 11 miles away from the present Laboratory, 234,000 square feet; nonpermanent type structure in the Evans area of 209,000 square feet.

What will those facilities be used for when we finally consolidate the Laboratory?

Among other things is to dispose of the Coles area which is unsuitable for our purposes and can be turned over to civilian activities.

Next is to move what is called the Signal Corps Equipment Support Agency which has to do primarily with getting equipment in shape for the letting of contracts for production by industry. That agency will be moved out of the present Cole area to Evans area for several reasons. Among other reasons, it has no particular need to be in the Hexagon, it would occupy space which should be occupied by the scientific personnel of the laboratory.

Then, again, we found as a result of past experience that close proximity to our scientists and development engineers is a great dis-

advantage when production personnel utilize the time of highly paid scientists on projects they should not be bothered with.

Through separation of the agencies we feel we can eliminate that difficulty.

The next item is, how much space per employee will the complete Hexagon provide?

When the third increment is completed the total space inventory, including corridors, ventilating shafts, conference rooms, will be approximately 955,864 square feet. For the planned occupancy of 3,100 people, this gives an average figure of 308 square feet per person. This compares very favorably with industrial research laboratories of a similar nature. For example, a large industrial electronics laboratory employs 1,075 people in 384,000 square feet, for an average of 357 square feet per employee.

This exemplifies the character of the modern electronic laboratories where large areas are filled with instruments and test devices.

The next item I already covered, why it is desirable to move the Signal Equipment Agency away from the Coles area.

A question which has arisen in the past has been with respect to the seemingly improper location of a parking area.

I would like to have Dr. Crenshaw give you more details on that. Dr. Crenshaw is the Chief Scientist for the Chief Signal Officer.

Dr. CRENSHAW. At the time the second increment was finished there were no parking lot facilities included for the second increment. A permanent type parking lot had been built and included in the first increment.

As a result, personnel who were coming to work in the second increment parked in the area wherein the construction equipment had partially hardened the soil.

When the fall came and the rains came this area started to become mired down. The post engineer put some gravel on it.

This continued in an impromptu fashion until it became obvious that it could not be solved in this manner.

Therefore a small amount of bituminous was put on top to prevent surface washing. About 10 percent of that temporary surface will have to be destroyed when the third increment is built.

However, the only alternative would have been to knock down trees to make adequate space.

That very briefly is the answer, sir.

General AKIN. We did expend some money there which might otherwise not have been needed to be expended, but it is unimportant under the circumstances.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was that because of the architect-engineers doing an improper testing job on the soil or was it just one of those things that happen occasionally?

Dr. CRENSHAW. Basically, because the total parking lot was included in the third increment of the building for the total number of employees. At the time of the second increment there was no parking lot facility for the additional employees for the second increment.

From there on it was a matter of doing as best we could.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Proceed.

General AKIN. Why do we now need additional facilities to accommodate 3,100 personnel when the building originally was planned for 4,500 personnel?

The space which was originally planned has been preempted by specialized and more extensive equipment and laboratory facilities required to support high priority missions assigned to the Chief Signal Officer by the Department of the Army Staff since 1948.

Dr. Crenshaw, can you add something to that?

Dr. CRENSHAW. As you know, we mentioned a high pressure-high temperature device in making new materials. The device occupies approximately the area of this hearing room. At the most there are three people there to operate it.

One of these is a senior scientist; another a junior scientist; another a technician.

When I visited the labs for a month last summer a third of the time these people were working elsewhere in the shops in connection with attachments and other facilities necessary to use this machine.

Out of this machine we have been able to make diamonds. This is the one way to prove you have accomplished the method of getting high pressures and temperatures simultaneously.

Four other groups in the world have done that.

We are planning to do the next harder one on a theoretical basis—namely, boron nitride which we hope will have some interesting electronic properties.

It may turn out to be a transistor type material in which case it can withstand extremely high temperatures.

We plan to make other materials of this type which can be predicted to be stable chemically if you can get them to be created.

As a result of this we hope we will be able to get materials with new properties and thereby be able to make new military equipment much simpler.

We also have in other areas in the present Hexagon a floating zone method of crystal purification. We are beginning to phase out of this because industry has now shown interest in this method of purifying materials for transistors, and there is no longer a need for us to break the forefront and lead the field. That work is being phased down.

That is one typical example.

Another is our tropical and arctic testing facilities and other facilities where we have gone to a large amount of automation so we will have large areas where there is only one man who has to monitor the activities of the machinery.

In this manner we have been able to use our personnel for work that only humans can do instead of for maintaining test on equipment.

General AKIN. The next item is whether inadequate R. and D. contiguous space at Fort Monmouth has retarded the space effort.

The completion of the Hexagon is an important segment of an integrated program of the Signal Corps to reduce the materiel cycle from constant troop issue, currently estimated at 115 months. The provision of the third increment, which would bring all the significant research and development elements of the Signal Laboratory together, would have a significant bearing on providing not just the facilities, but the means for improving operational procedures.

The research and development phase of the materiel cycle which takes an estimated 93 months of the 115 months of the total material cycle can be reduced by approximately 36 months.

Incidentally, in that connection, a study was made by a former chief signal officer which went into great detail on that particular phase of it, and in consultation with laboratory scientists and engineers. That apparently adequately proved that this reduction could be made. I have the result of this study here if you would like to put it in the record.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it charted or printed?

General AKIN. Typed material.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We shall insert it in the record.

(The information may be found on p. 725.)

General AKIN. The next item has to do with the estimated savings based on the completion of the third increment.

For the record I would like to read that.

The direct estimated annual savings which will accrue from the consolidation of Evans personnel and facilities in the third increment are: Elimination of the Evans motor pool, estimated saving $375,000.

This is detailed in the chart.

Next is elimination of duplicate functions such as security guards, mail rooms, library, receptionists, custodial services, and certain shop overhead, total $175,000. This is also detailed in the charts.

Next is an estimated savings of scientific and professional personnel time which is lost due to travel between the Hexagon and the Evans area. This approximates $50,000.

Next are the savings to be realized from the maintenance cost of temporary buildings which are to be disposed of, $124,644.

The items I just mentioned show a total estimated saving of $724,644.

An additional saving as the result of the increased efficiency must also be considered. It is estimated that as the result of centralized location the overall efficiency of the laboratory should increase by at least 10 percent.

With labor costs increasing to approximately $20 million per year, the value of this increased efficiency could be as much as $2 million annually.

Summarizing the dollar advantages, there is a possible total annual gain of roughly $2.7 million. On this assumption the third increment would be amortized in less than 3 years.

Gentlemen, that concludes my presentation. I would like to be able to answer any questions which you might have.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Questions?

Mr. JONAS. General, is your opinion and the basis of your feeling that this building should be completed, the fact that the current operations are being carried on in split locations or that additional facilities are needed?

General AKIN. A combination of the two. One is to consolidate the personnel and get the maximum effort from their close association.

The other is to have this added space in which they can operate in close proximity to desirable equipment of the appropriate type, such as labor-saving equipment, testing equipment, and other kinds of

equipment which would be available in this additional space which might otherwise be unavailable nearby due to a lack of space in the Evans Laboratory.

Mr. JONAS. The committee had some staff investigators go to Monmouth. They filed a report which indicates that the buildings in the Evans area are quite adequate and generally in satisfactory condition. That was the reason I wanted to get your view on that question and have you explain the basis for your belief that we need to complete the Hexagon.

You say it is a combination of the two?

General AKIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONAS. Is there any way that the work can be divided up so that one assignment is given to personnel at the Evans area and other work performed in the part of the Hexagon which already has been completed without the requirement of constant communication?

Dr. CRENSHAW. Take as an illustration the Mobidic, an Army-type field transportable computer so that one can bring to the Army area the capability of high-speed electronic computation to expedite the work at Army headquarters.

I was at the laboratories at the time that we set this contract out, and industry was skeptical, feeling it could not be done. It was only through the insistence of our people that it could be done that the contract was initiated.

This computer requires communications to and from it to be effective and to be really efficient in use. We wish to make the computer such that when the decision is made by the commanding general to implement some item that he has put on the computer to give him answers—if he says "I want to do it by the second option," the computer can then send the messages out directly to the subordinate supply echelons and they will bring the supplies in and start the materials flowing properly so the combat can be undertaken at the proper time. This requires intimate workings between the component group and the computer group.

For the first time we were able at the first attempt to have the devices of the component group which interconnect this computer with the communications system work perfectly. In all of our previous experience when the groups were subdivided, it required several attempts to get all these inconsistencies out. The original design seemed to be proper, but we put it together and it did not quite work right and we had to make modifications and changes. This is quite normal in the research and development process. Because these two groups were in adjacent areas, I figured this was one of the bases we should use to take the groups which had already been consolidated and see what we had gotten out of them.

Mr. JONAS. Do all the activities now being carried out at Evans require the use of the computer?

Dr. CRENSHAW. No, sir. The Evans group is concentrating primarily in the combat surveillance area. For the combat surveillance devices there was recently a picture in a Washington newspaper about a radar on the airplane for Army use. This is one of the results which came out of the contractual effort and our surveillance work. We plan to use drones; and for the drones to survive in a future battlefield they

must fly low over enemy territory because of the antiaircraft weapons which can be brought to bear against them. They will be beyond line of sight for this reason. The survival of the drone on return will be small. We need to get the data back by communications. The communications group occupies about one-third of the total Hexagon. The surveillance group is of approximately similar size. It is located down at Evans. There is no way to get those two groups together without completing the Hexagon.

Mr. JONAS. I do not think any member of the committee would argue with you that it is highly desirable and most convenient to have all the operations under one roof. I think that would be readily agreed. If I were running a research laboratory, I would rather have all of my research people close together. We have to go a little further than convenience. We have to be sure that it is not only convenient and desirable, but that it is necessary that we spend this money. Actually, the problem involves disposing of what appear to be some very desirable buildings down in the Evans area. They have a lot of use left in them.

General AKIN. We plan to use those buildings for the signal support agency. Modern requirements under space technology and the projects the laboratory is now being given demand that we do everything possible to reduce to the minimum the time involved in research and development. It is rather an essential factor, as you well know, in connection with modern warfare and our possible enemy, that we try to keep ahead of the procession rather than getting in on the tail end of it. We feel by consolidating in one laboratory we can keep up with the procession and probably keep ahead of it as we have in some of the recent measures that you know of which have been developed.

Dr. CRENSHAW. Along those lines, on the project for the SCORE satellite, the one which relayed the President's message by voice, we called in people from the Evans area and consolidated them in the Hexagon area on a temporary basis to accomplish this mission. It was the only way we could accomplish this in the time we had available to us. This is what we have had to do on these crash items. This means people who are brought in are dislocated from their normal shop relationships and have to work in a new environment. You can do this only with a few of them, because you do not have enough space to do it with all of them.

Mr. JONAS. That is all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you very much, Congressman Auchincloss and gentlemen, for this presentation. At the time we mark up our bill, your comments will be considered equally with the others in determining the total budget requirements. It is a pleasure to have you with us.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. May I express to you our appreciation of your courtesy and patience.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are a gracious gentleman.

General AKIN. May I join Mr. Auchincloss in his expression of appreciation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Thank you. That is all. The committee will stand adjourned until further call of the Chair.

APPENDIX

(The following information was requested by Mr. Sheppard on p. 540.)

The following projects totaling approximately $10.2 million will be funded from unapportioned balances of $12.2 million carried forward to fiscal year 1961. The remaining amount of approximately $2 million will be used to support projects which are included in this years authorization request.

ARMORY PROJECTS

	Type
Alabama:	
New Brockton	1 unit.
Ashford	Do.
Alaska:	
Fairbanks	1 unit, MVSB.
Ketchikan	1 unit.
Sitka	Do.
Bethel	Do.
California:	
San Fernando	Do.
Ventura	Do.
Georgia:	
Atlanta	2 units plus.
Eatonton	1 unit.
Marietta	Do.
Gainesville	Do.
Maine:	
Belfast	Exp.
Brunswick	Do.
Portland	Do.
Saco	Do.
Massachusetts:	
Saugus	1 unit.
South Boston	3 units.
Boston (Hyde Park)	2 units.
Michigan: Ishpeming	1 unit plus, MVSB.
Minnesota: St. Paul (west central)	4 units plus.
Nebraska: Wahoo	1 unit, MVSB.
New Mexico:	
Espanola	1 unit.
Socorro	Do.
New York:	
Catskill	1 unit, MVSB.
Patchogue	2 units.
North Carolina:	
Belmont	1 unit.
Greensboro	4 units plus.
Hendersonville	1 unit.
Laurinburg	Do.
Lincolnton	Do.
Rockingham	Do.
Shallotte	Do.
Wallace	Do.
Ohio:	
Elyria	1 unit plus.
Greenville	1 unit, MVSB.
Lancaster	Do.
Caldwell	1 unit plus.

ARMORY PROJECTS—continued

	Type
South Carolina:	
Jonesville	1 unit.
Chesterfield	Do.
Johnston	Do.
Pacolet Mills	1 unit plus.
Tennessee:	
Harriman	1 unit.
Kingsport	1 unit plus.
Oak Ridge	1 unit.
South Pittsburg	Do.
Texas:	
Texarkana	2 units.
Cuero	1 unit(s).
Dallas No. 5	4 units plus.
Virginia:	
Richmond	3 units plus.
Berryville	1 unit.
Washington: Colville	Do.
Wyoming:	
Lovell	Do.
Cody	Do.

NONARMORY PROJECTS

Iowa: Camp Dodge	MVSB.
Louisiana:	
Camp Beauregard	USPFO WH.
Do	CFMS.
Mississippi: Camp Shelby	CFMS.
North Carolina: Camp Butner	WH.
Vermont: Burlington	WH.

(The following information was requested by Mr. Sikes on p. 650:)

Installations transferred in whole or in part by Department of the Air Force to Department of Army and Navy

Fiscal year	Installation and location	Transferee
1955	Kansas:	
	1. Olathe Air Reserve Training Center	Navy: Naval Reserve training.
1956	Arkansas:	
	1. Erwin Air Force Auxiliary Field	Navy: Mobilization requirement.
	2. Walcott Air Force Auxiliary Field	Navy: Mobilization requirement (since excessed).
	California:	
	1. La Jolla AWS	Navy.
	Michigan:	
	1. Kellogg Field	Army.
	Mississippi:	
	1. Hancock Bombing and Gunnery Range	Navy.
	Texas:	
	1. J. Connally Air Force Base bombing range site.	Navy: Aircraft bombing and gunnery practice.
1957	California:	
	1. Los Alemitos radar bomb scoring site	Navy: Harbor defense.
	2. Santa Ava RBS	Do.
	3. Seal Beach RBS	Navy: Ammunition storage.
	4. Travis Air Force Base	Army.
	Maryland:	
	1. Sharps Island Air Force Range	Navy: Naval Air facility (training).
	Massachusetts:	
	1. Otis Air Force Base	Army: Fort Devens (support).
	New York:	
	1. Hancock Field	Navy: Marine Corps Reserve training.
	2. Plattsburg Air Force Base	Army: Reserve training.
	Texas:	
	1. Gray Air Force Base	Army: Family housing, Killeen Air Force Base and Gray Air Force Base.
	2. Wolters Air Force Base	Army: Army aviation training.
	3. Clear Springs Air Force Auxiliary Field	Do.
	4. Edward Gary Air Force Base	Army.
	5. Biggs Air Force Base	Army: Exchange per Public Law 84-929.

Installations transferred in whole or in part by Department of the Air Force to Departments of Army and Navy—Continued

Fiscal year	Installation and location	Transferee
1957	Florida:	
	1. Orlando Air Force Base	Army: Reserve training.
	2. Palm Beach Air Force Base	Do.
	Virginia:	
	1. Cheatham Annex Depot	Navy: Fuel supply depots.
	Washington:	
	1. McChord Air Force Base	Army.
1958	Kentucky:	
	1. Campbell Air Force Base	Army: Army aviation training.
	Massachusetts:	
	1. Marblehead Electronics Research Annex	Navy: Harbor defense.
	New Mexico:	
	1. Clovis Air Force Base Small Arms Range	Army: Reserve training, National Guard.
	New York:	
	1. Hancock Field	Navy: Marine Corps Reserve training.
	Washington:	
	1. Boeing-Everett plant	Navy.
1959	Arizona:	
	1. Wilcox Air Force Range	Army: Testing and experimenting, Fort Huachuca, Signal Corps.
	Kentucky:	
	1. Campbell Air Force Base	Army: Army aviation.
	Louisiana:	
	1. Barksdale Air Force Base	Army: Armed Forces special weapons, Bossier base, family housing.
	Texas:	
	1. Foster Tacan Annex	Navy: Support for Foster Air Force Base training operation.
	Virginia:	
	1. Byrd Field	Army: Quartermaster training, Fort Lee.
	Washington:	
	1. Fairchild Air Force Base	Army.
1960	California:	
	1. Parks Air Force Base	Army: Training and maneuvering area to replace Camp Stoneman.
	Louisiana:	
	1. Barksdale Air Force Base	Army: Armed Forces special weapons, Bossier base, sewage disposal.
	Massachusetts:	
	1. Otis Air Force Base	Navy.
	New York:	
	1. Manhattan Beach Air Force Base	Army: Family housing, NIKE battery.
	2. Niagara Falls	Army.
	Washington:	
	1. Boeing-Everett	Navy.

Installations transferred in whole or in part by Department of the Army to Departments of Navy and Air Force

Fiscal year	Installation and location	Transferee
1955	California:	
	Sharpe General Depot, Stockton storage activity.	Air Force: Station (storage).
	Mira Lona Quartermaster Depot	Do.
	Florida:	
	Key West barracks	Navy.
	Louisiana:	
	Baton Rouge Engineer Depot	Air Force: Station (storage).
	Maine:	
	Fort McKinley	Navy: Naval base.
	Trundy Point Military Reservation	Navy: Harbor defense.
	Massachusetts:	
	Fort Standish	Do.
	Fort Warren	Do.
	New Hampshire:	
	Fort Dearborn	Air Force: Aircraft control and warning station.
	New York:	
	Lake Ontario ordnance works	Air Force: Public Law 68, Public Law 38.
	Fort H. G. Wright	Navy: Underwater Laboratory.
	Syracuse Recruiting and Induction Station	Air Force: Hancock Field (support).
	Pennsylvania:	
	Marietta Transportation Corps Depot	Air Force: Station (storage).
	Rhode Island:	
	Fort Adams	Navy: Public Works Center.
	Texas:	
	Fort Hood	Air Force: Gray Air Force Base (support)

Installations transferred in whole or in part by Department of the Army to Departments of Navy and Air Force—Continued

Fiscal year	Installation and location	Transferee
1955	Utah:	
	Utah General Depot	Air Force.
	Ogden Ordnance Plant	Air Force: Hill Air Force Base (support).
	Virginia:	
	Battery Cove Military Reservation	Navy: Reserve training.
	Washington:	
	Middle Point searchlight site	Navy: Harbor defense.
	Deep Creek storage site	Air Force: Station.
	Fort Worden	Air Force.
1956	Alabama:	
	Birmingham Air Reserve Training Center	Air Force: Reserve training.
	California:	
	Fort Miley	Air Force.
	Fort Rosecrans	Navy: Deparming facility.
	LaJolla-Hermosa FCS	Navy: Communications cable, harbor defense.
	Georgia:	
	Blythe Island	Air Force.
	Indiana:	
	Terre Haute Ordnance Depot	Air Force: Planeor 61.
	Fort Wayne Air Reserve Training Center	Air Force: Air Reserve Center.
	Massachusetts:	
	Camp Edwards	Air Force: Otis AFB complex.
	Michigan:	
	Fort Custer	Air Force: Family housing, aircraft control and warning site.
	New Jersey:	
	Fort Dix	Navy.
	New York:	
	USARTC, Albany	Navy: Navy and Marine Corps Reserve training.
	Rhodes General Hospital	Air Force.
	Fort H. G. Wright	Navy.
	Camp Hero	Air Force: Aircraft control and warning station (Montauk Point).
	South Carolina:	
	Charleston TC Depot	Navy: Ammunition storage.
	Texas:	
	San Antonio General Depot	Air Force: Station.
	Houston ORC site, Plancor 143	Air Force: Radar bomb scoring site.
	Virginia:	
	Fort Story	Navy: Harbor defense.
	Washington:	
	Fort Flagler	Do.
	Fort Worden	Navy.
1957	California:	
	Camp Cooke, Triangular Div. Camp	Air Force: Vandenberg Pacific Missile Range.
	Branch, U.S. Disciplinary Barracks	Do.
	Georgia:	
	Augusta Arsenal	Air Force.
	Missouri:	
	Fort Crowder	Air Force: Plant No. 65.
	St. Louis Medical Depot, South St. Louis storage activity.	Air Force: Aero Chart Center.
	New Jersey:	
	Fort Dix	Air Force: Personnel Center (McGuire AF).
	Texas:	
	Fort Crockett	Air Force.
	Abilene AAF NG	Do.
	Virginia:	
	Fort John Custis	Air Force: Aircraft control and warning (family high school 6).
1958	California:	
	1. Fort Rosecrans	Navy: Nuclear submarine support, research laboratory, harbor defense.
	2. Fairfield Army storage site	Air Force: Station (Travis Air Force Base).
	New Jersey:	
	1. Fort Monmouth	Navy: Missile test operations.
	New York:	
	1. Army Reserve Training Center, Albany	Air Force: Reserve training.
	2. Camp Nero	Air Force: Aircraft control and warning station.
	3. AAA site, Floyd Bennett Field	Navy.
	Texas:	
	1. AAA skysweeper sites	Air Force.
	2. Fort Crockett	Navy: Reserve training.
	Virginia:	
	1. Fort Story	Navy: Harbor defense.
	2. Virginia Beach FCS	Do.
	3. AAA Norfolk site N-30	Do.
	4. Norfolk Defense Area AAA Battery 16	Do.

Installations transferred in whole or in part by Department of the Army to Departments of Navy and Air Force—Continued

Fiscal year	Installation and location	Transferee
1958	Washington:	
	1. Fort Lewis	Air Force: Ammunition storage (McChord Air Force Base).
1959	California:	
	Quartermaster bulk storage facility	Air Force.
	Fort MacArthur	Navy: Harbor defense.
	AAA gun site No. 53	Air Force.
	Do	Navy: Harbor defense.
	Fort Rosecrans	Navy.
	Indiana:	
	Terre Haute Ordnance Depot	Air Force Plant No. 61.
	Maine:	
	AAA Loring Air Force Base site 61	Air Force.
	Massachusetts:	
	Fort Redman	Navy.
	North Carolina:	
	Sunny Point Army Terminal	Air Force: Aircraft control and warning site (Fort Fischer).
	Texas:	
	Fort Bliss	Air Force: Biggs Air Force Base alert facility.
	LaPorte National Guard	Navy.
	Virginia:	
	Big Bethel	Air Force: Family housing, Langley Air Force Base.
	Washington:	
	Camp Hanford	Air Force.
	Fort Lewis	Air Force: Family housing, McChord Air Force Base.
	Seattle district engineer's office	Air Force: Plant No. 75.
1960	California:	
	1. Fort Baker Military Reservation	Navy: Harbor defense.
	2. Pillar Point Military Reservation	Navy: Instrumentation, Pacific Missile Range.
	3. Devils Slide Military Reservation	Navy: Harbor defense.
	Massachusetts:	
	4. Fort Rodman	Navy: Reserve training.
	5. Camp Edwards	Air Force: Otis Air Force Base (support).
	New York:	
	6. Fort H. G. Wright	Navy.
	Texas:	
	7. Killeen Base	Air Force.
	8. Camp Wolters	Navy.
	Washington:	
	9. Camp Hanford	Air Force.

Installations transferred in whole or in part by Department of the Navy to Departments of Army and Air Force

Fiscal year	Installation and location	Transferee
1955	Maryland:	
	1. Motor vehicle storehouse, Brandywine	Air Force: ARDC (storage).
1956	California:	
	1. Columbia steel plant, Torrance	Air Force.
	Florida:	
	2. Chief, Naval Operations, Monroe County	Army.
	New Jersey:	
	3. Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle	Army: Quartermaster, Fort Monmouth (storage).
	Rhode Island:	
	4. Sun Valley Rifle Range	Air Force.
	South Carolina:	
	5. Congarie Airbase	Do.
	Virginia:	
	6. Marine Corps School, Quantico	Do.
	7. Camp Perry	Army.
1957	Arizona:	
	1. Naval Electronics Laboratory, Dagelan	Army: Signal Corps, Fort Huachuca (operations).
	2. Naval Electronics Laboratory, Gila Bend	
	3. Naval Electronics Laboratory, Sentinel	
	California:	
	4. Marine Corps Base, San Diego	Air Force.
	Florida:	
	5. Malibar Field	Air Force.
	Louisiana:	
	6. Naval Air Station, Houma	Do.

Installations transferred in whole or in part by Department of the Navy to Departments of Army and Air Force—Continued

Fiscal year	Installation and location	Transferee
1957	Michigan:	
	7. Outlying field, New Port	Army.
	New York:	
	8. Naval Radar Station, Bellmore	Do.
	9. Marine Corps Training Center, Syracuse	Do.
	Pennsylvania:	
	10. Naval Ordnance Plant, York	Army: Storage.
	Rhode Island:	
	11. Construction Battalion Center, Davisville	Army.
	Texas:	
	12. Outlying field, Grand Prairie	Do.
	Washington:	
	13. Naval Supply Depot, Seattle	Do.
1958	Florida:	
	1. Spruce Creek Satellite Field	Air Force.
	Indiana:	
	2. Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane	Army: Storage.
	Massachusetts:	
	3. Martha's Vineyard	Air Force: Radio beacon.
	Michigan:	
	4. Naval Industrial Reserve Aircraft Plant, Warren.	Army.
	New Hampshire:	
	5. Fort Dearborn Military Reservation	Army: Cable at Rye, N.H., transferred for disposal purpose.
	Oregon:	
	6. Naval Air Reserve facility, Salem	Army.
	Virginia:	
	7. Marine Corps School, Quantico	Army: Signal Corps microwave tower.
	Washington:	
	8. Naval Air Reserve facility, Spokane	Air Force.
	9. Naval Supply Depot, Spokane	Army.
	10. Marine Corps Supply Depot, Tacoma	Do.
	11. Naval Reserve electronic facility, Yakima	Do.
1959	California:	
	1. Lexington housing development, Long Beach	Army: Reserve training.
	Colorado:	
	2. Naval Air Station, Denver	Air Force: Air National Guard.
	Florida:	
	3. Marine Corps air station	Army: Reserve training.
	Kansas:	
	4. Naval Air Station, Hutchison	Air Force: Air National Guard.
	Louisiana:	
	5. Naval Air Station, Houma	Air Force: Aircraft Control and Warning site.
	Massachusetts:	
	6. Mishaum Point, Dartmouth	Air Force: Air Research and Development Command.
	7. Fort Heath, Winthrop	Army: NIKE Missile Master Support.
	Nebraska:	
	8. Naval Air Station, Lincoln	Air Force: Air National Guard.
	New Jersey:	
	9. Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant, Newark.	Army.
	North Carolina:	
	10. Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point	Air Force.
	11. Enfield housing development	Army.
	Ohio:	
	12. Naval Air Station, Columbus	Army: National Guard.
	Pennsylvania:	
	13. Naval Station, Willow Grove	Army: Reserve training.
	Virgin Islands:	
	14. Airfield, St. Thomas	Do.
	Washington:	
	15. Naval supply depot	Army: National Guard.
	16. Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Tacoma	Air Force.
1960	California:	
	1. Camp Elliot, San Diego	Air Force: ATLAS missle test.
	2. Naval Air Station, Santa Rosa	Army: Signal Corps and OCDM joint use.
	Iowa:	
	3. Naval Air Station, Ottumwa	Air Force: MINUTEMAN missle logistic support.
	Michigan:	
	4. Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant, Centerline.	Army: Ordnance, family housing.
	New York:	
	5. Naval Industrial Reserve Plant, Brooklyn	Army: Reserve training.
	6. Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls	Army: Logistics support center.
	Washington:	
	7. Naval supply depot	Army.

LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Akin, Maj. Gen. S. D	722
Alenier, S. C	681
Anderson, C. W	23
Auchincloss, Hon. J. C	722
Baldinger, Leonard	23
Baldwin, Hon. J. F., Jr	708
Barth, Max	638
Bartlett, Comdr. J. V	563
Battison, Col. William	540
Bockelman, Lt. Col. Frederick, Jr	22
Bryant, Hon. F. S	638
Caldara, Maj. Gen. Joseph	22
Carmichael, Col. J. C	22
Charyk, Hon. J. V	22
Chase, Col. G. H	22
Clements, Lt. Comdr. D. C	633
Cohelan, Hon. Jeffery	710
Crenshaw, Dr. C. M	722
Curtin, Brig. Gen. R. H	22
Dorfman, Lt. Col. Herman	22
Douglas, Col. P. P., Jr	22
Doyle, Hon. Clyde	714
Eckhardt, Lt. Col. M. M	22
Edmonds, Col. M. T	22
Evans, Col. G. L., Jr	552
Fore, Allen	638
Friedman, Maj. Gen. R. J	22, 591, 692
Fulton, Harry	714
Garlock, Hon. L. S	22
Gibbens, J. R	22
Gibson, Capt. V. C	633
Goddard, Col. G. H	22
Greer, Brig. Gen. R. E	22
Holloway, Maj. Gen. B. K	22, 591
Hoover, Lt. Col. Herbert	23
Hosmer, Hon. Craig	714
Jensen, R. H	22
Kealer, Hon. R. C	714
Kent, Col. G. A	22, 591
Kinter, L. S	22
Lanman, M. H., Jr	1
Leonhard, Col. W. E	22, 591
Liles, Col. R. L	22
Lincoln, Hon. F. B., Jr	1, 692
LoForte, Comdr. R. I	633
Logan, H. R	1
Lucas, Col. R. G	22
Lynch, E. F	540, 552
Mayer, Andrew	681
McGee, Comdr. G. M	563
McGowan, Maj. Gen. D. W	532
Meis, Col. Joe	540
Minton, Maj. Gen. A. M	22
Minwegen, Comdr. A. P	563
Monahan, Brig. Gen. J. C	722

	Page
Montgomery, Capt. J. W. M	563
Moore, Col. L. R	532, 552
Murray, Lt. Comdr. J. E	633
Nichols, Col. F. K	22
Norton, M. A	638
Parkhill, Col. W. H	22
Pearson, Comdr. N. T	633
Peltier, Rear Adm. E. J	563
Perry, Col. L. D	540
Pomphrey, Lt. Col. P. J	22
Poole, H. W	1, 681, 692, 697
Renken, Rear Adm. H. A	563
Ridings, H. E	714
Roberts, S. M	714
Ross, Col. H. F	552
Runyon, Col. T. H	22, 591
Saund, Hon. D. S	712
Shelley, Hon. J. F	709
Smith, Col. Arthur	540
Smith, L. T	697
Stehling, Col. H. J	22
Stone, Col. C. A	22
Sufit, Herbert	22, 540
Sutherland, D. G	714
Swope, Comdr. I. L	563
Thompson, Lt. Col. H. B	552
Tiencken, W. P	563
Traub, Maj. Gen. D. W	532
Turner, L. E	22
Urbach, Lt. Col. L. H	22
Vance, Capt. G. F	563
Vidal, Brig. Gen. F. L	560
Villone, Lt. Col. V. J	22
Wade, W. C	714
Warren, Maj. Gen. F. M	552
Wheless, Maj. Gen. H. T	22, 591
Whittet, Robert	638
Wilson, Maj. Gen. W. P	537, 540
Wywal, Maj. F. B	23

INDEX

A

	Page
Aero Chart and Information Center, St. Louis, Mo	213
Air Force, Department of (*see also* individual projects, this index)	22
Aircraft control and warning stations	330, 442
Design information	444
Equipment, replacement of	447
Gap-filler sites	446
Pine tree locations	444
Air defense, changes in program	28
Air Defense Command	478
Air Force Security Service	416
Air Materiel Command	101
Air Research and Development Command	132
Air Training Command	160, 476
Air University	200
Alaskan Air Command	80
Architect-engineer contracts	43
Ballistic missiles. (*See* this subject, this index.)	
Base improvement program	30
Caribbean Air Command	333
Continental United States	79
Contract awards	35
Europe, Air Force	382
Various locations	408
Housing (*see also* this subject, this index):	
Capehart housing:	
Progress payments on	463
Heat pumps, experience with	466
Italy, family housing in	474
Okinawa, situation at	343
Oversea family housing cost data	441
Program, status of	462
Shell-housing modification	475
VIII housing support	462
Wherry housing:	
Procurement	465
Repair and improvement program	465
Inadequate facilities, replacement of	31
Medical and personnel facilities	31
Military Air Transport System	213, 335
Minor new construction	448
Access roads	453
Land acquisition	459
Land lease, Okinawa	461
Shell-housing modification	475
VIII housing support	462
Other operational support	29
Pacific Air Command	337
Planning	76
Program, 1961, status of	33
Real property disposals or inactivation	34, 47, 75
Repititive items	50
Aircraft maintenance docks	54
Aircraft ready shelters	61

Air Force, Department of—Continued
Repititive items—Continued Page
Aircraft weapons calibration shelter 60
Approach lights and narrow gage and centerline lights 64
Corrosion-control facilities 57
Engine inspection and repair shops 62
Flight-safety items 62
Mobile testing facilities 74
Operational mission training building 50
Powered-ground equipment shop 55
Precision measuring equipment laboratory 53
Shop, armament, and electronics 58
Shop refueling vehicle 56
Wing headquarters buildings 52
Revisions, 1961 31
Significant factors in programing 25
Strategic Air Command 230, 374
Dispersal maintenance program 67
Strategic forces, operating facilities for 26
Tactical Air Command 314
Under Secretary, statement of 24
Unobligated balances 30
Various locations, Europe 408
Altus AFB, Okla 232
Amarillo AFB, Tex 162
Andersen AFB, Guam 379
Andrews AFB, Md 209
Antigua test site, British West Indies 152
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn 132
Ascension Island, Widewater Field 156
Azores, Lajes Field 335

B

Ballistic missiles 591
Access roads 605
Funds for 16, 21
Program for 597
Base support 608
Bases, criteria for 659
BOMARC, effect of cancellation of 692
Communications, cost of 605
Congressional action on 696
Cost estimates, validity of 604
Deterrent force required by United States 597, 624
Funds, status of 596
Guidance and control development contract 607
Land requirements 603
Launch control centers, capabilities of 603
MINUTEMAN:
Effectiveness of 626, 628
Hill AFB, facilities at 130
Mobility of 608, 614, 617
Potential sites for 616
Program for 600
NIKE-ZEUS, use of Johnston Island for 694
Operational development test and training silos, need for 602
Personnel support facilities 606, 613
POLARIS, funds for 16, 21
Research and development programs, funding of 630
Silo lid, design of 607
Technical support 602
TITAN, program for 598
Barksdale AFB, La 234
Beale AFB, Calif 236
Bergstrom AFB, Tex 238
Bethel AFS, Alaska 81
Blytheville AFB, Ark 275

Page

British West Indies, Antigua Test site ... 152
Brooks AFB, Tex ... 176
Bunker Hill AFB, Ind ... 240

C

Canal Zone, Howard AFB ... 333
Cannon AFB, N. Mex ... 320
Cape Canaveral Missile Test Annex, Fla ... 154
Carswell AFB, Tex ... 242
Castle AFB, Calif ... 279
Charleston AFB, S.C ... 219
Chaumont, France ... 391
Clinton County AFB, Ohio ... 310
Clinton Sherman AFB, Okla ... 244
Columbus AFB, Miss ... 282

D

Davis Monthan AFB, Ariz ... 246
Defense, Department of ... 638, 681, 697
Access roads ... 12
Assistant Secretary, Comptroller, statement of ... 1
Assistant Secretary, Properties and Installations, statement of ... 638
Changes in program ... 16, 692
Existing facilities, use of ... 10, 12, 19
Housing programs. (*See* this subject, this index.)
Language changes ... 697
Maintenance and operation, funds for ... 14
Obligations, postponement of ... 18
Properties and installations. (*See* this subject, this index.)
Requirements and costs, validity of ... 6
Research and development, funds for ... 13
Small business, participation of ... 10
Unobligated balances ... 8, 20
Dover AFB, Del ... 221
Dow AFB, Maine ... 287
Duluth Municipal APT, Minn ... 479

E

Edwards AFB, Calif ... 135
Eglin AFB, Fla ... 137
Eielsen AFB, Alaska ... 83, 100
Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak ... 248
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska ... 85
England:
Bentwaters RAF Station ... 387
Chicksands, RAF ... 419
Lakenheath Hospital ... 470
England AFB, La ... 317
Ernest Harmon AFB, Newfoundland ... 374

F

Facilities, joint use of ... 533, 558
Fairchild AFB, Wash ... 290
Forbes AFB, Kans ... 250
France, Chaumont ... 391
Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyo ... 293

G

Galena APT, Alaska ... 87, 100
Geiger Field, Wash ... 481
Gentile, AFS, Ohio ... 101
Germany:
Bitburg Airbase ... 389, 409
Hahn Airbase ... 396
Ramstein Airbase ... 400
Sembach Airbase ... 402, 415
Spangdahlem Airbase ... 404
Wiesbaden Airbase ... 406, 416

	Page
Glasgow AFB, Mont	295
Goose AFB, Labrador	376
Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak	483, 518
Greece:	
Athenai APT	383
Iraklion Air Station	423
Griffis AFB, N.Y	103
Guam, Andersen AFB	379
Gunter Air Force Base, Ala	200
H	
Hamilton AFB, Calif	486
Hawaii, real property in	656, 670, 672
Heath Maintenance Annex, Ohio	105
Hickam AFB, Hawaii	228, 547
Hill AFB, Utah	108
MINUTEMAN facilities at	130
Holloman AFB, N. Mex	140
Homestead AFB, Fla	252
Housing programs:	
Capehart housing:	
Maintenance of	675
Program for	652
Total liability for	9
Insurance for	20
Rental housing	670
Standardization of	13
Wherry housing:	
Acquisitions of	660
Total liability for	9
Howard AFB, C.Z	333
I	
Italy:	
Aviano Airbase	385
Family housing in	474
J	
James Connally AFB, Tex	164
Japan:	
Itazuke AFB	346
Misawa Airbase	351
Wakkanai Air Station	437
Yokota Airbase	371
K	
Keesler AFB, Miss	181
Kelly AFB, Tex	112
King Salmon APT, Alaska	89
Kirknewton, RAF, Scotland	427
K. I. Sawyer AFB, Mich	488, 520
Kincheloe AFB, Mich	491, 521
Kingsley Field, Oreg	496, 524
Kirtland AFB, N. Mex	142
Korea:	
Kunsan Airbase	357
Osan Airbase	365
Kotzebue AFS, Alaska	91
L	
Labrador, Goose AFB	376
Lackland AFB, Tex	184, 476
Ladd AFB, Alaska	93
Lajes Field, Azores	335
Larson AFB, Wash	301

	Page
L. G. Hanscom Field, Mass	146
Loran stations	633
Loring AFB, Maine	254
Lowry AFB, Colo	166
Luke AFB, Ariz	322
M	
Mainsite	425
March AFB, Calif	256
Mather AFB, Calif	187
Maxwell AFB, Ala	203
McChord AFB, Wash	498
McCoy AFB, Fla	258
McGuire AFB, N.J	223
McClellan AFB, Calif	114
Minot AFB, N. Dak	500, 524
Moodt AFB, Ga	197
Mount Hebo AFB, Oreg., water supply for	332
Mountain Home AFB, Idaho	260
Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C	315
N	
National Guard	532, 537, 540
Air	540
Barnes Municipal Airport, Mass	544
Congaree Air Base, S.C	545
F–102 aircraft, requirements for	551
Foss Field, S. Dak	546
Hickam AFB	547
Hutchinson Naval Air Station, Kans	548
Minor construction	550
Planning and design	543
Army	537
Armories:	
Facilities, total	532
Obligations	532
Existing facilities, use of	536
Jackson Municipal, Miss	549
Obligations, status of	532, 540
Nellis AFB, Nev	325
Newfoundland, Ernest Harmon AFB	374
Northeast Cape AFS, Alaska	95
Norton AFB, Calif	116
O	
Offutt AFB, Neb	262
Okinawa:	
Housing at	343
Kadena Airbase	349
Land lease	461
Naha Airbase	361
Okinawa M site	363
Otis AFB, Mass	504
Oxnard AFB, Calif	506, 575
P	
Paine AFB, Wash	508, 528
Patrick AFB, Fla	149
Perrin AFB, Tex	190
Philippine Islands:	
Clark AFB	338
Wallace Air Station	369
Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y	264
Pope AFB, N.C	319

Page

Properties and installations 638
Development and review of program, 1961
Hawaii, real property in 656, 670, 672
Hospital construction 654
Housing. (*See* this subject, this index.)
Inactivation of facilities 665
Missile bases, criteria for 659
Nonessential projects, elimination of 647
Planning, measures to improve 640
Possible changes in military construction program 646
Reserve forces facilities, funding program for 640
Utilization of facilities 648

R

Ramey AFB, P.R 381
Reese AFB, Tex 168
Reprograming requests 467
Reserves:
Air Force 560
Army 552
Formula for requirements 556
Program, 1961, summary of 555
Facilities, joint use of 558
Naval 563
Fort McHenry, Md., Naval Reserve Training Center 581
Funds and program, status of 566
New York Naval Air Station 579
Phoenix, Ariz., Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center 583
Topeka, Kans., Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center 586
Richards-Gebaur AFB, Mo 510
Robins AFB, Ga 118
Ryukyu Islands:
Kume Shima Air Station 355
Miyako Jima Air Station 359
Yuza Dake Air Station 373

S

Sacramento Peak, N. Mex 158
Sandbag 439
Scotland, Kirknewton RAF 427
Scott AFB, Ill 225
Selfridge AFB, Mich 512, 528
Seymour Johnson AFB, N.C 327
Sheppard AFB, Tex 194
Shu Lin Kou Air Station 433
Site I–5 431
Site 2–T 429
Site 3–T 435
Site 9–T 421
Sparrevohn White Alice, Alaska 97, 101
Special foreign currency appropriations 681
Stead AFB, Nev 170
Stockbridge Test Annex, N.Y 121
Suffolk County AFB, N.Y 514, 530

T

Tainan Air Station, Taiwan 367
Tinker AFB, Okla 123
Travis AFB, Calif 227
Turkey:
Cigli Airbase 393, 409
Incirlik Airbase 398, 415
Turner AFB, Ga 266
Tyndall AFB, Fla 516, 531

U

Page

Unlalakleet AFS, Alaska 99

V

Vance AFB, Okla 172
Vandernberg AFB, Calif 268

W

Walker AFB, N. Mex 270
Webb AFB, Tex 174
Westover AFB, Mass 272
Whitman AFB, Mo 274
Wideawake Field, Ascension Island 156
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 125
Wurtsmith AFB, Mich 304

○